University of Bombay Publication

HINDU EXOGAMY

HINDU EXOGAMY

By

S. V. KARANDIKAR, M.A.

BOMBAY:

D. B. TARAPOREVALA SONS & Co.

"KITAB MAHAL", HORNBY ROAD

1929

Printed by G. G. Bhatt at the Advocate of India Press, 21, Dalal Street, Fort, Bombay & Published by D. B. TARAPOREVALA SONS & Co. 'Kitab Mahal'', Hornby Road, Fort, Bombay.

PREFACE

Of all the social problems, marriage is of the paramount importance. It is a factor which is vitally connected with the guaranteed continuation of the human race. Most of our moral ideas are based upon the institution of marriage. The savage and the civilized have alike felt its importance. Originally a social question, almost all over the world, it is intermingled with religion; and thus, the problem becomes somewhat a complex one.

According to the ancient Hindu ideas, marriage is an essential preliminary and an instrument in achieving the fourfold aims of life. Hindu marriage is governed by two sorts of restrictions: endogamous and exogamous. Every Hindu must marry within his endogamous sub-caste, and outside the exogamous group, variously known as *gotra, got, mūl, kul, intiperulu, tārvād*, etc. In the present work I have confined myself to the consideration of only the exogamous restrictions.

Since the entry of the Indo-Aryans in India, the Brahmin has been constantly at work to establish his spiritual superiority, not only over the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas, but also over the mixed and purely Dravidian races. The Brahmin has proved eminently successful in his mission. All non-Brahmin Hindu castes, high or low, are being slowly Brahmanized, though, perhaps, the Brahmin may not be any longer honoured as the spiritual head. The caste, that adopts the Brahmanical ideals and dogmas more completely and more extensively, is regarded higher in its social status than the surrounding castes. In consideration of this gradual Brahmanization of all Hindu castes, I found it necessary to examine the Brahmanical rules of exogamy at some length in the present work.

The work is far from being an exhaustive one; but I have tried to touch almost every side of the subject within the narrow limits in which I set myself to work.

In discussing the problem of the *pravaras,* the writings of Dr. S. V. Ketkar and Mr. Kṛishṇaśāstrī Ghule on the subject have proved highly useful to me.

For the spelling of Sanskrit words I have followed the system of transliteration adopted in the Cambridge History of India with slight variations as far as the sibilants are concerned. The index was made for me by my friend Mr. S. N. Gokhale.

I am extremely thankful to the University of Bombay for a handsome subsidy that was granted to cover a part of the cost of publication.

Finally, I should like to express my gratitude to Dr. G. S. Ghurye, University Reader in Sociology, Bombay, but for whose encouragement and guidance I would have neither undertaken the work nor completed it.

Bombay, S. V. Karandikar.
June, 1929.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER III

Pravara

CHAPTER IV

Connection between Gotra and Pravara

Connection between gotra and pravara—Millions of gotras grouped under ten pravara heads—Indirect reference to the ten divisions in the Brāhmaṇas—Slight difference of the Brāhmaṇa divisions from the divisions in the Sūtras—Seven divisions named after the 'Seven Ṛishis'—Peculiar fascination of the Indo-Aryan mind for the number seven—Eighth division named after Agastya—Significance of the prefix 'Kevala' attached to the Bhṛigu and Aṅgiras groups—Some independent divisions in the Brāhmaṇas later coerced down under Kevala Bhṛigus and Kevala Aṅgiras—Possibility of changing the pravara-group—Illustrations, anecdotes of Śunaḥśepa and Gṛitsamada—So also the conversion of Kratu, Pulaha and Pulastya families to Agastya-group —Real meaning of such terms as Vasishṭhāḥ, Bhārgavāḥ etc.—Recitation of the individual pravaras always preceded by the two names of Manu and Bharata—Men ignorant of their pravaras asked to borrow the pravaras of their spiritual guru—Father's gotra, not inherited by the son by mere birth—Gotra conferred upon a boy at the time of the initiation—Gotra and adoption—Gotra in relation to birth and death impurities—Very restricted impurities before the initiation—The sameness of gotra and pravara inoperative in determining the succession—Recitation of one uniform pravara 'Manu' recommended by Tāṇḍins—Confusion of discipleship with blood-relationship due to more than one reason—Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa passage—In ancient India the teacher respected far above the father.

pp. 60-90

CHAPTER V

The Gotras and Pravaras of the Kshatriyas and Vaisyas

CHAPTER VI

Sept Exogamy in Sūtra Times

CHAPTER IX

Sapiṇḍa Exogamy in the Sūtra and Smṛiti Works

CHAPTER X

Development of the rule of Sapiṇḍa Exogamy after the Eighth Century

HINDU EXOGAMY

CHAPTER I

Exogamy in Vedic Times

Even though the word 'Hindu' is popularly understood to denote a homogeneous race, labours of ethnologists have proved that the race, now conveniently called the Hindu, counts among its components such divergent races as the Indo-Aryans, Dravidians and Mongolo-Dravidians. A Brahmin from U.P., the representative par excellence of the pure Indo-Aryan blood and the pariah of Madras, the representative of the Dravida or Ādi-Dravida race, or a Munda from Bengal, are all equally proud to-day of being called the Hindu. In spite of the ethnic differences, in spite of the keen social distinctions based upon caste, all these races have been classed 'Hindus' for all administrative purposes. They have lived together on the Indian soil for some thousand years; and as is quite natural, civilization and culture of each is very materially influenced and coloured by the civilization and the culture of the other. There has been much lending and borrowing on either side, sometimes deliberate, sometimes unconscious. During these long times, mixture of blood was inevitable; but complete fusion of races never took place. Every race has maintained its distinct physical type. Much modified as it is, due to constant crossing in the past, one is always distinguishable from the other. In the province of social life also, every race has preserved some of its peculiar social customs. It has been rightly observed that the Indian Dravida was no doubt politically conquered by the Indo-Aryan; but in matters social, the Dravida can hardly be declared to be vanquished. Here he proved almost an equal of the Indo-Aryan. The Aryan conqueror taught the vanquished Dravida

many things; and at the same time he had to learn many things from the Dravida.

The Hindus are exogamous as a rule; and at the same time due to the prevalence of rigid castes and sub-castes which are practically innumerable, Hindus are endogamous also. The very rigid caste endogamy of the Hindus has perhaps no parallel in any other social organization of the world primitive or civilized. The exogamy of the Hindus has two sides—sept exogamy that prohibits marriage between members of the same sept or gotra who are all believed to have descended from one common ancestor; and sapiṇḍa exogamy which prohibits marriage within certain generations counted from the father as well as the mother. In some castes the rules of exogamy are very comprehensive; with others they have rather a limited scope. However, marriage between the members of the same sept, gotra or got is generally looked upon as the most accursed thing. Marriage with a sapiṇḍa relation also is condemned in strong language by the Hindu law-givers. It will be the subject of this work to describe the different forms of exogamy, prevalent among the Hindus, and to trace their probable origin and subsequent developments. In doing so, the question who was the lender and who was the borrower in this matter shall have to be dealt with. Finally, an attempt will be made to consider the subject in the light of the principles of modern eugenics.

Marriage customs in different Branches of the Aryan Race

As the Aryan race or specifically called the Indo-Aryan race by Sir Herbert Risley is the leading race in India, it will be suitable to begin our enquiries with them. That the Indo-Aryans are not the natives of India, but they were invaders and conquerors

of India at least four thousand years ago, and that, before their arrival in India, they lived in company with, and formed a part of, the ancient Iranians, are now undisputed facts. "As the Ionians, Dorians, etc., were different tribes of the Greek nation whose general name was Hellenes, so the ancient Brahmins and the Parsis were the two tribes of the nation which is called the Aryas, both in the Veda and the Zend-Avesta. The former may be compared with the Ionians; the latter with Dorians.[1]" On comparing the dialects of the Zend-Avesta with the language of the Ṛigveda, we find a striking similarity—a similarity that diminishes as soon as we reach the classical literature in Sanskrit[2].

The study of marriage customs therefore among the Indo-Iranians would enable us to formulate our ideas as to what sort of marriage customs the Indo-Aryans brought from the Indo-Iranian home. Strictly speaking, the history of the Indo-Iranians before the dispersion is little known to us. But from the study of the life of ancient Iranians as depicted in the Zend-Avesta and Pahlavi texts, we can get some information as to the nature of the life that the Indo-Iranians led. It has been observed that the various offshoots of the great Aryan race were conspicuous by the absence of exogamy among them[3]. A contrary view has been maintained by some writers. Morgan traces sept exogamy to the ancient Greeks and Romans. Marriage was contracted, according to Morgan, outside the gens in Greek and Roman societies[4]. Senart goes a step further, and maintains that the Aryans practised some form of exo-

1 Haug, "Essays," p. 69.

2 Ibid. p. 70.

3 Frazer, Vol. II. p. 330.

4 "Ancient Society," pp. 224, 290.

gamy even in Indo-European days[5]. Evidence for Morgan's and Senart's contention is, however, very meagre, and unconvincing. The ancient Teutons do not seem to have observed any more exogamous restrictions than barring the marriage between ascendants and descendants, and between brothers and sisters[6]. In the ancient Greek society, "forbidden degrees were few, the practical working of the laws of inheritance and adoption being to encourage marriage between near relations, and even to enforce it. Marriage of cousins was common. Union of uncle and niece was possible and even of aunt and nephew....... There were, it seems, no other prohibited degrees of affinity except between individuals in the direct line of descent or ascent.[7]"

Regarding the gens exogamy of the Greeks and Romans, Morgan's assertion that the gens formed an exogamous unit does not seem to be correct. The gens was an endogamous unit, and not an exogamous one[8]. It was the household, and not the gens, that constituted the exogamous unit. In the ancient Roman society, marriage between brother and sister was barred, and so between the first cousins on the paternal side; but second cousins could freely intermarry. Even the cousins-german were allowed to intermarry from the fifth century after Christ[9]. " The Roman like the Greek law compelled an heiress to marry her nearest kinsman. In later times, cousins undoubtedly married without let or

5 " Les castes dans l'Inde," translated in the " Indian Antiquary," Vol. XLI. p. 110.

6 Westermarck, Vol. II. p. 101.

7 W. J. Woodhouse, in " Ency. of Religion & Ethics," (1915), Vol. 8, p. 445.

8 W. Warde Fowler, in " Ency. of Religion & Ethics," (1915), Vol. 8, p. 463.

9 T. W. Greene, " Roman Law," (1884), p. 48.

hindrance....... .In Livy's oration of Sp. Ligustinus, there is this clause: My father gave me to wife his brother's daughter."[10] If a sort of sept exogamy did exist among the Indo-Germans as Senart believes, we naturally expect it to appear fully matured among the Greeks and Romans. In that case some penalty ought to have been prescribed for the violation of exogamous restrictions. Facts, however, fall very much short of our expectation. The law of exogamy is nowhere actually enunciated in contemporary literature, and the question of penalty for the breach of the law really does not arise.

As far as the ancient Iranians are concerned, fortunately we have sufficient evidence to arrive at definite conclusions. In the Zend-Avesta and Pahlavi texts we find no trace of exogamy ; on the other hand inbreeding of the most intense type was practised by the Iranians. Next-of-kin marriage under which father and daughter, mother and son, brother and sister were mated together, is very highly spoken of by Parsi Scriptures[11]. A passing reference is made by Bṛihaspati, a Smṛiti-writer of the fifth or sixth century, to the marriage between son and mother prevalent among the Parsis[12]. Most probably, this connection between parent and child which is attributed to the ancient Iranians, is an exaggerated statement. Perhaps the interpretations, put on ancient works by the European scholars, are incorrect. Whatever it might be, we cannot readily believe that such incestuous practice of mating the parent and the child was ever followed by any civilized society, within the time-limits known to history. Modern Parsi writers

---

10 Huth, p. 56.

11 S. B. E. Vol. XVIII. pp. 393, 395, 397, 404.

12 Bṛihaspati. XXVII—21 ; S. B. E. Vol. XXXIII. p. 389.

are very emphatic in asserting that the next-of-kin marriage has been misunderstood by foreign translators of the Parsi Scriptures[13].

After reading the Parsi Scriptures carefully, one cannot help thinking that the ancient Parsis not only did allow marriage between very near relations, but looked upon it as an act of the highest merit[14]. The best next-of-kin marriage is between the sister's daughter and brother's son. The second best next-of-kin marriage is that of a brother's son with a younger brother's daughter, or of a sister's son with a younger sister's daughter; while the intermarriage of the elder sister's son and the younger sister's daughter is an inferior next-of-kin marriage[15]. Whatever may be the original meaning of the next-of-kin marriage, as early as the date of the composition of the Dinkart, next-of-kin marriage had come to bear its present meaning of marriage of first cousins. The recent Parsi Rivayats have the same interpretation. Dinkart has put forth three reasons in recommending the next-of-kin marriage. It helps to preserve the purity of the race. It tends to increase the compatibility between husband and wife and lastly, it increases the affection for children which will be felt in redoubled measure for offsprings so wholly of the same family[16]. This detailed analysis of next-of-kin marriage almost leaves no room in our mind for doubt as to the actual practice of consanguineous marriages in ancient Iran.

---

13 Darab Dastur Peshotan Sanjana, in his appendix to "Zarathushtra in the Gathas," pp. 205, 206, 207.

14 Mgr. Baron C. De. Harlez, "Introduction to the Avesta," translated by P. A. Wadia, p. 280.

15 S. B. E. Vol. V. pp. 389, 390.

16 Louis H. Grey, in "Ency. of Religion and Ethics," (1915), Vol. 8, p. 458.

Thus, sept exogamy in any form was entirely non-existent among ancient Iranians, and even in modern times, a Parsi girl can marry with a parallel cousin on the paternal side. In the Avesta, there is not a word to suggest that the Parsis were ever familiar with sept exogamy, even in the days prior to the Avesta. The intense inbreeding of the Parsis may be the result of the peculiar circumstances in Iran and the religious scruples of the Parsis to unite only with the faithful[17]. But, as we fail to find the least reference to sept exogamy even by way of condemnation in the old Iranian literature, it will be a legitimate conclusion to say that sept exogamy was not probably practised also by the Indo-Iranians. If sept exogamy was once practised and then given up by the Iranians, we may naturally expect a strong denunciation of the old custom in the Parsi Scriptures. Whenever an old custom is to be abolished, and a new one quite contrary to the old is to be introduced, it is but natural that the person who enunciates the new rule will prepare his ground by criticising and condemning the old custom. In any case, when a law-giver introduces a novel rule to supersede and contradict the old one, he cannot but help referring to it. Parsi Scriptures are vehement in denouncing the religious and social dogmas of their opponents, the ancestors of the ancient Brahmins who lived together for some time with the Iranians. If sept exogamy had been current among the ancestors of the Indo-Aryans, Parsi Scriptures, while advocating the next-of-kin marriage, would have certainly assailed and ridiculed the exogamy, preached or practised by their opponents. From all these facts we may reasonably deduce that sept exogamy was unknown to the Indo-Iranians.

---

17 S. B. E. Vol. XVIII. p. 429.

Exogamy in the Ṛigveda Times

As sept exogamy had been unknown to the Indo-Iranians, we may reasonably conclude that the Indo-Aryans, while they were settling down in the plains of the five rivers, did not observe it. At least, at the outset, sept exogamy was unknown to the Indo-Aryans. There are very few references to marriage in the Ṛigveda, and they do not give the slightest indication of the prevalence of sept exogamy. Besides, considering the fact that the Indo-Aryans were settling down in a new land, their numbers must be necessarily small, and the limited population of the new settlers was naturally unfavourable for the novel introduction of sept exogamy among them. The present exogamy of the Indo-Aryans is based upon gotra or got. But the very word 'gotra' occurs in the Ṛigveda only five or six times; and it has not been used there in the sense of sept. An objection may be raised that if the word gotra was not used in the Ṛigveda times to denote a sept, the then sept exogamy among the Indo-Aryans may have been based upon some other social unit. If it had been so, in the vast Vedic literature some literary remnant, indicating sept exogamy, would have been found.

There are one or two hymns in the Ṛigveda which go to prove that young girls enjoyed the privilege of choosing their husbands in Vedic times. Courting, so universally absent in the modern Hindu society, was current among the marriageable girls of the Ṛigveda times. The idea of courting has been suggested by the word 'van,' which is explained in later works on Kāma-śāstra, as winning the heart of one's beloved. Father's duty was confined in such cases to give his consent to the selection made by his daughter[18]. There is no difference between this sort of Vedic marriage and the

18 Ṛig. X—27-12.

Gāndharva form of marriage as recognised in later Sūtra and Smṛiti works. In a system of marriage where love is allowed to play its full part, there are very few chances for the development and observance of sept exogamy. In another Ṛigveda hymn, some scholars read that Sūryā was united with Aśvins, because they won the running race[19]. If this interpretation is correct, the Svayaṁvara practice of marriage, described in the epics and the Purāṇas, shall have to be traced back to the Ṛigveda times. If Svayaṁvara i.e. the selection of the bride-groom by the girl after a due trial of the competing suitors was allowed in the Ṛigveda times, it will be an additional reason to conclude that sept exogamy, in all probability, did not exist in early Vedic days.

There is another piece of evidence to prove that sept exogamy was absent among the Indo-Aryans at one time. The following verse has been quoted from Brahmapurāṇa by Aparārka in his commentary on Yājñavalkya-Smṛiti : "Celibacy for a long period, carrying the camandalu, marriage with a sagotra or sapiṇḍa relation, cow-slaughter, human sacrifice, horse sacrifice and wine—these things the twice-born should avoid in Kali age[20]." Whenever a thing is considered 'Kalivarjya,' it means that the thing was once in practice and was later disapproved, and so it fell into disuse. This verse proves, beyond any doubt, that at one time sagotra marriage was not prohibited in India. In Hemādri's work we get a slightly different read ng of the verse. According to Hemādri's reading, the verse is capable of more than one interpretation. The writer of Nirṇayasindhu makes it mean that in Kali age the daughter of the father's sister and the daughter of the

19 Ṛig. I-116-17.
20 Aparārka. p. 63.

maternal-uncle should be avoided in marriage[21]. I think, however, that the reading from Hemādri should be interpreted in such a way, as will be in a line with the reading from Aparārka. An objection may be raised that such an interpretation will be a forced one; but the same charge can be directed against the interpretation suggested by the Nirṇayasindhu. Besides, we cannot ignore the fact that Aparārka is more ancient than Hemādri, and his reading of the Brahmapurāṇa must be regarded more authoritative; and even if the quotation from Brahmapurāṇa given by Aparārka be incorrect, the fact remains that a learned writer of the eleventh century like Aparārka believed that sagotra marriages were not prohibited in India at one time.

Although sept exogamy was unknown to the Indo-Aryans in early Vedic times, they were accustomed to observe some form of sapiṇḍa exogamy. How many generations exactly were avoided from the father's and the mother's side under the rule of their sapiṇḍa exogamy by the ancient Indo-Aryans, it is difficult to tell. But, if we examine the various references to marriage in the Ṛigveda, we shall be able to arrive at some conclusions on this point. Our attention is first directed to the famous dialogue between Yama and Yamī in the Ṛigveda.[22] Yama and Yamī are represented as brother and sister in the Vedic as well as in the Iranian mythology. The very dramatic dialogue is unfortunately left incomplete. Yamī is maddened with passion, and she presses her brother Yama to accept her for his mate. Yama, however, is very emphatic in his stand against such incestuous connection. Yama warns his sister that man's actions are watched by the spies

21 Nirṇayasindhu, p. 403.

22 Ṛig. X–10.

of gods, and directs her to go to some one for the satisfaction of her passion. Although the dialogue is incomplete, the impression that is left on our mind is that the composer of the hymn is opposed to the marriage between brother and sister. In Buddhistic literature we find some references to brother and sister marriage. Daśaratha Jātaka tells us that Rāma and Sītā, the hero and the heroine of the great epic, Rāmāyaṇa, were previously related as brother and sister, and later on, they married and became husband and wife. Another reference to marriage between brother and sister happens to be in the Mahāvaṁso. A prince named Sīhabāhu married his uterine sister, Sīhasīvali.[23] Now, as regards the first reference, it is probably a deliberate perversion of the Brahmanical version of the Rāmāyaṇa. Regarding Sīhabāhu's marriage with his sister, if it is not entirely mythical, even from the Māhāvaṁso, we may see that it is an incident belonging to the prehistoric age.

The following passage occurs in the seventh book of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa: "He who has no child has no firm footing. This even know the beasts. Hence the son cohabits (among beasts even) with his mother and sister. This is the broad well-trodden path on which those who have sons walk free from sorrow. Beasts and birds know it. Thence they cohabit even with their mother. Thus he told (to Hariśchandra)[24]." In connection with the above passage it has been argued that the ancient Indo-Aryans, being anxious for a son, did not mind much whether they cohabited with their mother or sister. This conclusion may appear plausible, and especially so, when we remember, that in Iran

23 "Mahāwanso," edited by Turnour, (1837), Vol. I. p. 46.

24 A. Brāhmaṇa, 7—13—(9, 10); Haug, p. 462.

the Aryans did indulge in consanguineous marriages. With regard to the dialogue between Yama and Yamī, it is possible to interprete it otherwise. Mr. R. C. Dutt reads in the myth of Yama and Yamī the natural phenomenon of day and night, the latter always following the former, but never coming in contact with it. But all these speculations are completely set at rest when we take into consideration how emphatically Prajāpati's incestuous connection with his daughter has been condemned both in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa[25] and the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.[26] As soon as the gods observed Prajāpati's incestuous deed, they cried aloud, "Prajāpati commits an act never done before"; and Prajāpati was punished for his deed, his body being pierced through with an arrow.

If the Yama and Yamī hymn shows that the ancient Indo-Aryans disapproved of the connection between brother and sister, another hymn in the tenth Maṇḍala will show that the Indo-Aryans usually married outside their family. Eighty-fifth hymn of the tenth Maṇḍala is called the marriage hymn, and some of the stanzas of that hymn are even now used on the occasion of marriage. We see from the hymn that at the time of the marriage the bride and the bride-groom were generally strangers to each other. Marriage was contracted outside the family. Upto what generation family relationship was recognized cannot be definitely ascertained; but if we are justified in basing our argument on the analogy of different Aryan peoples, we may reasonably say that, among the early Indo-Aryans, family relationship ceased in the fourth generation. As has been shown by Hearn, Aryan household included

25 A. Brāhmaṇa, 3-33; Haug, p. 218.
26 Ś. Brāhmaṇa, 1-7-4; S. B. E. vol. XII. pp. 208, 209.

the descendants of a common great grand-father, but went no further.[27] According to Schrader, an Aryan house-community consisted of agnatic blood relations only to the second or third degree.[28] Following verses from the hymn will show that marriage was generally between strangers, there was distance and sometimes considerable distance between the homes of the bride and the bride-groom,and the bride on entering the husband's house was asked by him to domineer over her father-in-law, mother-in-law, sister-in-law, etc. The verses in question run thus :—

" Let Pūshan hold your hand and take you away from this place ; let Aśvins carry you in their chariot. Go to your (new) house as the lady of the place, and speak to the people, gathered there, in a winning way."[29] "Those robbers who assail the couple on the road may not find you. You may reach the difficult place (destination) by easy paths. May (your) enemies run away."[30] "This bride is endowed with all auspicious signs ; come and see her. Give her auspicious blessings and go back to your respective homes"[31]. " Rule over your father-in-law, and mother-in-law, and domineer over your sister-in-law and brother-in-law."[32]

After reading these verses, one cannot but conclude that the Indo-Aryan married outside his family. The custom of marrying outside the family must not, however, be confused with sept exogamy, which, as I have already said, was unknown in the early Vedic days.

27 " Aryan Household," (1879), p. 181.

28 " Prehistoric antiquities of the Aryan people," translated by Jevons, (1890), pp. 393, 394.

29 Ṛig. X—85—26.

30 „ X—85—32.

31 „ X—85—33.

32 „ X—85—46.

Marriage outside the family has for its basis the knowledge of actual descent from a common ancestor, while the sept exogamy is based upon the dogmatic belief that so many families are descended from a common ancestor. In the Ṛigveda times gotra organization was yet to develop; so marriage outside the family is to be understood in the literal sense of the word.

Thus, in the early Vedic times i.e. the Ṛigveda times, although some generations of agnates were excluded in marriage, as far as the cognates were concerned, principle of exogamy had made very little progress. This will appear quite natural, when we take into account the predominantly agnatic character of the Aryan organization. In the Indo-Aryan society cognates could intermarry in the third generation. The following passage from the Ṛigveda is decisive on this point: "Come, O Indra, by fine paths to this sacrifice and receive your share. They "have offered you fat mixed with ghee, that is your share, as the maternal-uncle's daughter or the paternal aunt's daughter is one's share in marriage."[33] Aparārka reads the passage in a different way: "O Indra, come to our sacrifice together with other drinkers of Soma; and partake of your portion of Soma, that has been left for you by them, just like the daughter of the father's sister who is most unsuitable for being one's wife. This Soma is therefore your lot continuously (like a stream of water)."[34] From the clumsy sense of the verse that has been somehow brought out of it by Aparārka, one may easily see that Aparārka's reading of the verse is an incorrect one; or it may be that he has deliberately changed the original reading. Aparārka wrote in the eleventh century; and by that time in the

33 Aufrecht's Ṛigveda, Vol. II. p. 672.

34 Aparārka, p. 83.

whole of Northern India, sapiṇḍa exogamy, that avoided five generations on the mother's side and seven generations on the father's side, was in full force. So Aparārka was naturally anxious to show that there was no reference in the Ṛigveda or other Vedic literature that favoured marriage in the third generation. But, after all, these efforts of Aparārka to prove that in Vedic times sapiṇḍa exogamy of later days was followed in its entirety are vain. While commenting on the thirty-third verse of the Āchārādhyāya of Yājñavalkya, he has already quoted the Brahmapurāṇa to the effect, "Observance o celibacy for a long time, carrying the camandalu, marriage with sagotra and sapiṇḍa relations, cow-slaughter, human sacrifice and horse sacrifice and wine are to be avoided by the twice-born in the Kali age." That Brahmapurāṇa placed sapiṇḍa marriage under Kalivarjya (things not to be done in the Kali age) really shows that at one time marriage with mother's sapiṇḍa and marriage with father's sapiṇḍa, in other words marriage in the third generation with the cognates, was approved of in the Indo-Aryan society.

The Ṛigveda text approves of marriage between the children of the brother and the sister. Marriage between parallel cousins on the father's side was completely out of the question due to their near agnatic relationship. But what can we say regarding the intermarriage of parallel cousins on the mother's side? In the whole Vedic and Puranic literature, we fail to find any prominent example of such marriage. Relying on this negative evidence, we shall not, however, be justified in concluding that the intermarriage of the children of two sisters was forbidden in the ancient Indo-Aryan society. In the Roman society children of two sisters could intermarry.[35] With the Iranians, this was

35 Huth, p. 56.

one of the popular matings. In the modern Hindu society, this kind of marriage is strictly forbidden. Marriages between parallel cousins whether paternal or maternal are regarded as almost equally objectionable. Considerations of consanguinity cannot satisfactorily explain the prohibition, in as much as marriages between cross-cousins are permitted or at least tolerated. As will be pointed out in the sequel, the stern prohibition of mating parallel cousins on the mother's side presupposes well established sept exogamy. As the ancient Indo-Aryans were not accustomed to sept exogamy, there seems no plausible reason why they should prohibit the intermarriage of the children of two sisters. On the other hand, Manu, the greatest and the most ancient law-giver of the Indo-Aryans, condemns in similar terms the marriage between cross-cousins and the children of two sisters.[36] If the Indo-Aryan had never married his mother's sister's daughter, Manu would not have thought it necessary to condemn the practice in strong language. For knowing carnally one's female relatives such as the uterine sister, father's sister, mother's sister and maternal uncle's wife several penances are prescribed by Yājñavalkya, Nārada, Vishṇu and Parāśara.[37] No penances are, however, prescribed for connection with the females in the third generation such as father's sister's daughter, mother's sister's daughter etc. If the mother's sister's daughter had been unmarriageable from very ancient times, the Smṛiti-writers would have naturally placed the sin of knowing carnally the mother's sister's daughter on a par with the sin of knowing one's uterine sister.

36 Manu. XI—170, 171.

37 Yājñvalkya. chapter on penances, 232, 233. Nārada. XII-73, 75; S. B. E. Vol. XXXIII. pp. 179, 180. Vishṇu. XXXVI—4, 5; S. B. E. Vol. VII. p. 134. Parāśara. X—9, 10, 11, 12.

To sum up, therefore, the state of exogamy in early Vedic times i. e. in the Ṛigveda times, we fail to find any clear evidence for the existence of sept exogamy. All circumstantial evidence speaks against the prevalence of sept exogamy in the Ṛigveda times. The passage, quoted from Brahmapurāṇa, directly says so. The marriage-hymn in the tenth Maṇḍala, however, leads us to conclude that at the time of marriage the bride and the bride-groom were often strangers; and thus some generations of agnates were excluded in marriage. It has been further noticed that marriage could take place with the cognates in the third generation.

Exogamy in later Vedic Period

Leaving the Ṛigveda period and coming down to the Brāhmaṇa works and other Saṁhitā works, we do not yet find any mention of sept exogamy. Younger brothers and sisters who anticipate their elders are censured in these Saṁhitās, and special titles are coined to denote the various parties. Thus, the younger brother marrying before the elder is called Parivividāna. The brother so superseded is called Parivitta and so on.[38] As we shall see later on, gotras and pravaras had been established in Brāhmaṇa times. The word 'sagotra' actually occurs in Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa, not in connection with marriage, but in connection with the drinking of Soma.[39] But we do not find a word about sept exogamy. In the Sūtra works that followed almost immediately, the rule of sept exogamy is stated in such terms as show that it had been well established long since. In some Sūtras we find that penances are actually prescribed for sagotra marriage. It seems, therefore, quite natu-

38 Mai. Saṁhitā, 4-1-9; Vāj. Saṁhitā, XXX-9; Tai. Brāhmaṇa, 3-2-8-12.

39 T. Brāhmaṇa, 18-2-12.

ral, that sept exogamy must have made its first appearance in the Brāhmaṇa times. Why there should not be the slightest reference to sept exogamy in the whole Vedic literature, we cannot satisfactorily explain. All that we may say is that the rule of sept exogamy was yet in its infancy, and although it may have been generally followed in the days of the Brāhmaṇas, its breach was not yet considered a sin. As is observed by Jolly, because the rule of gotra exogamy is mentioned in the Gṛihya Sūtras, it must have been in vogue from times much prior to the composition of those works.[40] Weber also has expressed a similar opinion. On the whole, we may be justified in presuming that sept exogamy must have been introduced among the Indo-Aryans in Brāhmaṇa times, although no direct reference is made to it in the Brāhmaṇa literature.

As far as sapiṇḍa exogamy was concerned, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa tells us that marriage might take place in the third generation or fourth generation. "From one and the same person spring both the enjoyer (husband) and the enjoyed (wife); for now kinsfolk live sporting and rejoicing together, saying: 'in the third or fourth generation we unite.[41]" Macdonell and Keith are of opinion that this passage speaks of marriage in the third or fourth generation with the agnates. In this way a girl may be allowed to marry her paternal uncle's son.[42] This interpretation is untenable on more than one ground. As we saw in the preceding paragraph, gotra exogamy is clearly enjoined in most of the Sūtra works; and its beginning must be traced back to the Brāhmaṇa times, if not to an earlier period. Even in the Ṛigveda times,

40 "Recht und Sitte," p. 62.
41 Ś. Brāhmaṇa, 1-8-3-6; S. B. E. Vol. XII. p. 238.
42 V. Index, Vol. I. p. 236.

we have seen that marriage was outside the family, and some generations of agnates were avoided in marriage. There is one more objection that can be raised against the theory. Paternal uncle's son is called Bhrātṛivya in Vedic literature, and Bhrātṛivya in Saṁhitā and Brāhmaṇa times was a synonym for an enemy.[43] It is not, therefore, probable, that a girl would like to marry her Bhrātṛivya. Thus, the Śatapatha passage sanctions marriage in the third or fourth generation not of the agnates but of the cognates only. Harisvāmin, the commentator, observes that the Kaṇvas allow intermarriage in the third generation, and the Saurāshṭras intermarry in the fourth generation. But Harisvāmin does not evidently refer to the third or fourth generation of the agnates.

Thus, it will be seen that a girl could marry with her cognates in the third or fourth generation till the days of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa; but later on, this limit was gradually raised to five generations on the mother's side, and seven generations on the father's side. But law-givers who flourished after the Christian era were not satisfied with the mere raising of the limit of generations to be avoided on the father's and mother's side. They aim at showing that even in ancient times five generations on the mother's side and seven on the father's side were avoided in marriage. We have seen how Aparārka distorted the original text of the Ṛigveda Khila-hymn to prove this proposition. With later writers marriage of Subhadrā with Arjuna is a stock subject for argument. Subhadrā is well known in the Purāṇas as the sister of Kṛishṇa; and Kuntī, the mother of Arjuna, was the sister of Vasudeva, the father of Kṛishṇa and Subhadrā. Thus, in marrying Subhadrā, Arjuna

43 V. Index, Vol. II. p. 114.

married his maternal uncle's daughter. The enthusiasts who wrote on Dharma after the Christian era would not tolerate this. Kumārila, the author of Tantravārtika, so argues on this point: "Kṛishṇa was the son of Devakī; Balarāma of Rohiṇī; and Ekānaṁśā was born of Yaśodā. But the Harivaṁśa says that the seventh Garbha of Devakī was transferred from her womb to Rohiṇī at Vishṇu's bidding by Nidrā for fear of Kaṁsa, and became Balarāma; that Nidrā herself was directed by Vishṇu to be born of Yaśodā as her daughter called Ekānaṁśā; that Ekānaṁśā and Kṛishṇa (born of Devakī) were made to change places; that Devakī said to Kaṁsa that she gave birth to a daughter and that Vishṇu speaks of Balarāma as 'his' (Nija) aṁśa and of Nidrā as of his own family i.e. these two, though born of different mothers, are still styled 'his own' (Nija) by Kṛishṇa. Therefore, Subhadrā, though spoken in the Mahābhārata as the sister of Vāsudeva, need not have been the real sister of Vāsudeva Kṛishṇa. She was probably the daughter of the sister of Vasudeva's mother or she was the daughter's daughter of the sister of the father of Kṛishṇa's mother (step-mother Rohiṇī). A maternal aunt's daughter may be called a sister and is often so called. How would Kṛishṇa who gave expression to the lofty sentiments of the Bhagvat-Gītā encourage a usage that is so sinful?"[44] I have purposely given this tedious quotation from Kumārila to show how later writers tried their utmost to disprove the fact that the Indo-Aryans married in ancient times their cognatic relations in the third or fourth generation. To achieve this end, they would resort to any wild theory or they would adopt any tortuous interpretation. And, after all, what has been really proved by Kumārila? Following the analogy of the use of the word 'Nija' in the

44 Vyavahāra-Mayūkha, edited by P. V. Kane, pp. 201, 202.

Harivaṁśa, he suggests that in the Mahābhārata Subhadrā may have been called Krishṇa's sister only conventionally. This explanation, if it is worth that name, is certainly unconvincing. What is the use of quoting Harivaṁśa? The Harivaṁśa does not declare—it does not even hint—that Subhadrā was not the real sister of Krishṇa, but was a very distant kin. Neither the Harivaṁśa nor any other Purāṇa lends support to the speculative theory of Tantravārtika.

In the Harivaṁśa two more marriages with the cognates in the third and the fourth generation are mentioned.[45] Pradyumna, the son of Krishṇa and Rukmiṇī, was married to the daughter of Rukmī i.e. his maternal uncle. This was a marriage in the third generation. Pradyumna's son, Aniruddha, was married to Rochanā, a grand-daughter of Rukmī. This was a marriage in the fourth generation. From Buddhistic literature also we find that marriage of cousins was not unusual. "The marriage of princess Vāgirā with king Ajātaśatru, the son of her father's sister, is an illustration of the kind of marriage. Māgha, a house-holder of Magadha, married his maternal uncle's daughter named Sujātā. Ānanda was enamoured of the beauty of his father's sister's daughter and wanted to marry her".[46] The Mahāvaṁso speaks of continuous cross-cousin marriages in the families of the Śākya kings.[47]

Thus, although sept or gotra exogamy may have made its first appearance in the Brāhmaṇa times, sapiṇḍa exogamy i.e. the rule of prohibited degrees does not seem to have advanced more than the avoidance of two generations of the cognates.

45 Harivaṁśa, (published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal), 6711, 6722, 6723.
46 B. C. Law, in Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. II. pp. 564, 565.
47 Mahāwaṅso, edited by Turnour, (1837), Vol. I. p. 9.

CHAPTER II

Gotra

All sections and sub-sections of the Indo-Aryan race are now exogamous. Their exogamy has two aspects. The first aspect prohibits marriage between persons related to each other within certain generations on the father's and mother's side; while the other aspect of exogamy bars marriage between members of the same sept. We shall first examine exogamy among the Brahmins who were and who have been the leaders and exponents of the Indo-Aryan culture. The exogamous restrictions among the Brahmins which are very rigid are based upon gotra and pravara system. The hold of gotra on the mind of the Brahmin is so great that, although under the influence of the western civilization he has either given up or relaxed many religious dogmas and social prejudices, he still devoutly follows the exogamous restrictions based on gotra and pravara. Even in this twentieth century, the slightest breach of these restrictions is unthinkable. How deep-rooted are the prejudices of the people on this point may be seen from the storm of protests that was raised in 1918 against Mr. V.J. Patel's Bill to legalise sagotra marriage.

No persons belonging to the same gotra and reciting the same pravara can be mated together. Such connection is considered incestuous; and the progeny born of such wedlock is considered Chāṇḍāla or the pariah[1].

The common belief among the Brahmins is that persons belonging to the same gotra are born from a common ancestor, and the various pravaras attached to each gotra are also the names of very remote illus-

1 Yama Smṛiti, quoted in Pravara-Mañjarī, p. 7.

trious ancestors. They further believe that these divisions of gotra and pravara, and the exogamy, based thereon are very ancient.

Both these beliefs, deep-rooted as they are, are erroneous. We shall first try to see the origin and development of gotra and pravara. As the two ideas are inter-related, unless we thoroughly examine the gotra and pravara problem, the real nature of exogamy among the Brahmins cannot be properly understood. The subject has been passingly referred to by many oriental scholars; but it has never been as yet exhaustively discussed by any one. Mr. P. Chentsalrao has published a collection of Sanskrit tracts and treatises dealing with gotra and pravara in a work styled 'Gotrapravaranibandhakadambam.' He has prepared a list of at least four thousand gotras, and as a book of reference, the work is invaluable for a student of the Brahmanical gotras and pravaras. Prof. Zimmer has discussed at some length the problem of the gotra and pravara in his 'Studien Zur Geschichte Der Gotras.' Mr. C.V. Vaidya has written an explanatory note on gotra and pravara in his 'History of Mediaeval Hindu India' Vol. II. A Nagpore antiquarian, Mr. Kṛishṇaśāstrī Ghule, has also given a lucid and ingenious explanation of the subject in the Chitramaya–Jagat, a Marathi Magazine, in the year 1923. Besides this, a paper on 'gotra and pravara and their incidence on marriage' was read by Professor K. Rangachari at the Oriental Conference, Madras. The paper has been since published in the proceedings of the third Oriental Conference, Madras, 1924.

Mr. Vaidya's Views regarding Gotra

It will be convenient to open the discussion with what Mr. Vaidya has to say on this subject: "According to the latest view the gotra Ṛishi is a son or rather a

descendant of one of the Seven Ṛishis with the addition of the eighth Agastya who is outside the well-known Seven Ṛishis of Baudhāyana. According to Baudhāyana's dictum the original Indo-Aryan families were considered to be eight, viz., 1. Viśvāmitra, 2. Jamadagni, 3. Bharadvāja, 4. Gautama, 5. Atri, 6. Vasishṭha, 7. Kaśyapa, and 8. Agastya. But an important Śloka in the Mahābhārata takes us still further back, and states that originally there were four gotras only.

"Mūla-gotrāṇi chatvāri samutpannāni Bhārata Aṅgirāḥ Kaśyapaśchaiva Vasishṭho Bhṛigurevacha".

Śānti P. 296.

"These ancient four gotras, Aṅgiras, Kaśyapa, Vasishṭha and Bhṛigu are supported by the Pravarādhyāyas also in several Sūtras which always begin with Bhṛigu Pravara. Now this shows that, when the first or Solar race Indo-Aryan invaders came to India, there were four family stocks, 1. Bhṛigu, 2. Aṅgiras, 3. Kaśyapa, and 4. Vasishṭha. They were the patriarchs—so to say the mind-born sons of the Creator and they were progenitors of all the three Aryan classes. They in fact were not Brahmin Ṛishis but Aryan-Ṛishis."

"Now Bhṛigu's name does not appear in the Saptarshis; but that of his descendant Jamadagni does. So also Aṅgiras is substituted by his two grandsons, Bharadvāja and Gautama. Therefore, in order to constitute the later eight stocks, we have to add Atri, Viśvāmitra and Agastya. It is clear that Atri stock represents the second horde of Aryan invaders i.e. the Lunar Race Aryans, as the moon is looked upon as the son of Atri and Lunar Race Aryans have generally the Atri Gotra. Agastya is entirely a new addition; but it took place in Vedic times; for Agastya is a Vedic Ṛishi, while Viśvāmitra, an Indo-Aryan Kshatriya, became

a Brahmin and a Pravara Ṛishi by his austerities. Viśvāmitra was, therefore, a Solar Race Kshatriya stock, which became priest by his intelligence and his religious merits.[2]"

I have taken this long quotation from Mr. Vaidya's work with the intention that his view point should be clearly made out and the discrepancies in his statements should be vividly seen. He first states that the descendants of the Seven Ṛishis and Agastya the eighth are the gotras. This definition is, however, a faulty one. Commentaries on the Mahāpravarādhyāyas of the Sūtra-writers mention the fact that Baudhāyana based his definition on Pāṇini's dictum: "A descendant being a grand-son or a still lower offspring is called a gotra.[3]" Baudhāyana has, however, overlooked the real nature of Pāṇini's definition as well as its context. While commenting on the definition of gotra as given by Baudhāyana, Nārāyaṇa, a commentator on Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, has rightly remarked that Pāṇini's definition is a technical one[4]. The context in which Pāṇini gives it supports Nārāyaṇa's proposition. The Sūtras that immediately follow the above Sūtra are as follows: "But, when one in a line of descent beginning with a father (and reckoning upwards) is alive, the descendants of a grand-son or a still lower descendant is called Yuvan.[5]" "When an elder brother is alive, the younger brother gets the title of 'Yuvan' being the descendant of grand-son.[6]" "The living descendant of a grand-son etc. is optionally called a 'Yuvan' when a more superior sapiṇḍa other than a brother is alive.[7]" By adopting

2 "History of Mediaeval Hindu India", Vol. II. pp. 56, 57.
3 Pāṇini, 4-1-162; Vasu, p. 622.
4 Ā. Ś. Sūtra, p. 871.
5 Pāṇini, 4-1-163; Vasu, p. 623.
6 „ 4-1-164; Vasu, p. 624.
7 „ 4-1-165; Vasu, p. 624.

Pāṇini's definition for the explanation of the Brahmanical gotra, Baudhāyana virtually declares that the Seven Ṛishis and Agastya are not the gotras, while their descendants constitute the gotras, which is an anomaly as observed by the commentator; because the Seven Ṛishis and Agastya are popularly known as gotras. In the verse, quoted by Mr. Vaidya from the Mahābhārata, Aṅgiras, Bhṛigu, Kaśyapa and Vasishṭha are themselves called the gotras. Thus, the two passages, one from Baudhāyana and the other from the Mahābhārata, which Mr. Vaidya supposes as complementary, contradict each other.

According to Mr. Vaidya, Bhṛigu, Aṅgiras, Kaśyapa and Vasishṭha are the four great progenitors of the first three classes of the Indo-Aryans. He considers them Aryan Ṛishis rather than Brahmin Ṛishis. Mr. P. Chentsalrao also in his introduction to 'Gotrapravaranibandhakadambam' has argued in favour of the theory that the first three classes of the Indo-Aryans are the direct descendants of the Seven Ṛishis. Now, both the views are not supported by any authority. The Sūtra-writers exhaustively deal with the gotras of Brahmins; but as far as the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas are concerned, they finish the matter within two or three Sūtras. Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas are recommended to borrow the pravaras and gotras of their priests; or the Kshatriyas may repeat the stock pravara ' Manu, Ila and Purūravas,'; while the Vaiśyas may recite the one pravara 'Vatsapri' or 'Bhālandana. The commentators of the Sūtras are of the same opinion and the commentators of Smṛitis also affirm the same thing. Whether the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas had their own gotras is an important question; and I have treated it fully in the present work later on. What concerns us for the present is that from the Sūtras as well as

from their commentaries on which Mr. Vaidya mainly relies, it does not at all follow that the whole of the Indo-Aryan race, consisting of the first three classes, sprang up from the great patriarchs. Mr. Vaidya, in declaring that Bhṛigu, Aṅgiras, Kaśyapa and Vasishṭha were the progenitors of the first three classes, seems somewhat conscious at heart, that at best these Ṛishis were the progenitors of the Brahmin caste and not of the other castes; because in the passage that I have just quoted from his work in full, he tells us that Viśvāmitra was a Kshatriya, and by his austerities became a Brahmin and a pravara Ṛishi. What does this conversion of Viśvāmitra really mean? It means clearly that the gotra or pravara Ṛishis, if at all, were the progenitors of the Brahmin caste and not the other castes. If the three castes were born of the four patriarchs, Viśvāmitra, a Kshatriya, would not have been compelled to practise austerities to be declared a gotra or pravara Ṛishi.

In Mr. Vaidya's opinion, Bhṛigu, Aṅgiras, Kaśyapa and Vasishṭha are the most ancient patriarchs—the mind-born sons of the Creator ; while Agastya, Atri and Viśvāmitra are later additions. He thinks that Atri was the last to come, and he represented Lunar Aryan hordes that defeated the Solar Aryans that had preceded them. Now, all these conclusions of Mr. Vaidya are mere speculations. Agastya, according to Mr. Vaidya, is rather recent, while Vasishṭha is ancient. But, from the evidence of the Ṛigveda itself, this statement is disproved. Agastya and Vasishṭha were born simultaneously from the seed of Mitra and Varuṇa, and Agastya was the senior, because he came out of the upper portion of the pot in which the seed was deposited[8], and it

8 Ṛig. VII—33-13.

was Agastya who introduced Vasishtha to the Tritsus[9]. Thus, Agastya was not posterior to Vasishtha but was his contemporary. The same thing can be proved about Viśvāmitra. The most important feature of Vasishtha's life, whom Mr. Vaidya considers much anterior to Viśvāmitra, was apparently his hostility to the latter[10]. The enmity between Viśvāmitra and Vasishtha is proverbial; and it has proved the source of store of mythological stories in the later epics and Purāṇas. In the sacrifice, performed by Hariśchandra, Vasishtha was the Brahmā and Viśvāmitra was the Hotṛi[11]. Atri whom Mr. Vaidya considers the most recent is declared by Manu to be a contemporary of Vasishtha and a mind-born son of Brahmā[12]. The last recension of the Mahābhārata, from which Mr. Vaidya has quoted the verse in question, chronologically coincides with the present version of Manu-Smṛiti; or rather it is later, because in the Anuśāsana Parva in a chapter on marriage, Manu is quoted by name and the rule of exogamy is attributed to him. Thus, Mr. Vaidya is not justified in concluding, solely on the authority of an isolated verse from the Mahābhārata, that Atri represents the second horde of the Aryans, and that he is the last addition to the old stock of the Indo-Aryans. If Mr. Vaidya does not consider Manu's evidence sufficiently trustworthy, the same thing may be proved also from the Ṛigveda. One hundred and eightieth hymn of the first maṇḍala of the Ṛigveda is a hymn composed by Agastya. The authorship of Agastya is not at all doubtful as far as the present hymn is concerned. Agastya's name as the composer of the hymn is mentioned in the eighth

9 Ṛig. VII—33-10.

10 V. Index, Vol. II. pp. 274, 275.

11 A. Brāhmaṇa, 7-16; Haug, p. 465.

12 Manu. I-35.

verse of the hymn. In the fourth verse of that hymn, Agastya mentions Atri by name and declares that "Atri turned the very Great into a sweet and cold thing like water." The hymn proves that Atri was not only a contemporary of Agastya, but was perhaps more ancient than Agastya; and Agastya I have already proved to be a contemporary of Vasishṭha. The same conclusion is confirmed by a hymn from the seventh maṇḍala the reputed authors of which are Vasishṭha and his sons. Sarvānukramaṇī which is the last word of authority with Mr. Vaidya declares Vasishṭha to be the composer of the particular hymn, and in that hymn the composer says to Aśvins that Atri was a great favourite with them[13]. Thus, Atri must be either a contemporary of Vasishṭha or even senior to Vasishṭha.

Out of the eight gotra Ṛishis, Mr. Vaidya thinks that Atri was the sole representative of the Lunar Aryan race. Now, as the Lunar Aryan race defeated the first horde of the Indo-Aryans of the Solar race, the second horde must be sufficiently strong in their numbers; otherwise they could not have triumphed over the Solar race Aryans, who by this time must have settled down in the plains of the Punjab and U.P., fortified themselves, and must have made alliances with the natives of India. Atri, therefore, must be the representative of the vast numbers of the second horde of the Indo-Aryans whom Mr. Vaidya is pleased to style Lunar race Aryans. Atri-gaṇa or Atri-gotra may be, therefore, expected to be very wide and extensive; but from the perusal of the Pravarādhyāyas of all Sūtra-writers, we find that Atri-gaṇa is comparatively very small. Looking to the other gaṇas collectively, Atri-gaṇa is almost negligible.

Another question may be directed against Mr. Vaidya. When the four original gotras developed into eight,

13 Ṛig. VII-68-5.

why were the two original names of Bhṛigu and Aṅgiras dropped, and Jamadagni, the descendant of Bhṛigu, and Gautama and Bharadvāja, the two grandsons of Aṅgiras, were included in the list of the eight families? When did this change take place? What were the peculiar circumstances that were responsible for this dropping of the two ancient patriarchs and substituting their grandsons and their descendants? There is another difficulty. Jamadagni is found to be a contemporary of both Vasiṣṭha and Viśvāmitra. Jamadagni officiated in the sacrifice of Hariśchandra, and a constant feud was maintained between Jamadagni and Viśvāmitra. So they must be contemporaries; and, as Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra are contemporaries, Jamadagni also must be allowed to be a contemporary of Vasishṭha, the ancient patriarch. Bharadvāja is considered the grandson of Aṅgiras by Mr. Vaidya, and Bharadvāja's name, according to him, was added to the old list at some later date. But, here also, he is groping in the dark. Bhṛigu, Aṅgiras, Kaśyapa and Vasishṭha are the great patriarchs—the progenitors of the first three classes of the Indo-Aryans. So they must be all contemporaries; and Bharadvāja was a grandson of Aṅgiras, and as his name was added at a later date, he must have flourished some time after Vasishṭha. But from the Vedic literature we find that Bharadvāja was the family priest of Divodāsa[14], the father or grandfather of Sudāsa whose famous family priests were alternately Vasishṭha and Viśvāmitra. Thus, Bharadvāja was senior to Vasishṭha, at least by one or two generations.

After the formation of the eight gotras at the close of the Ṛigveda period, Mr. Vaidya proceeds, new gotras were formed after the names of the most illustrious

14 T. Brāhmaṇa, 15-3-7.

descendants of the Seven Ṛishis and Agastya. But, here also, one pertinent question may be put to Mr. Vaidya. Paraśurāma, the son of Jamadagni, was the invincible hero of the Brahmins; stories are told that he extirpated the Kshatriyas twenty-one times; and still no gotra is current in his name. Similarly, no gotra is current in the name of Kṛishṇa Dvaipāyana Vyāsa, or the sage Durvāsas. Mr. Vaidya shall have to admit that all the three are sufficiently illustrious names; and the matter does not end there. According to Baudhāyana, there are millions and millions of gotras[15]. Does Mr. Vaidya hope to prove that all these gotras are the direct illustrious descendants of the Seven Ṛishis and Agastya? One who wants to establish the theory of descent must prove it. Mr. Vaidya absolutely produces no evidence to prove his statements.

As regards the term 'Seven Ṛishis,' what does it exactly mean? We find different views regarding the 'Seven Ṛishis,' founded on different authorities. In the Ṛigveda the word occurs twice[16]. But we are not sure whether the seven stars, representing the Saptarshi group or actual seven human personages are meant. According to Baudhāyana, the Saptarshis are Jamadagni, Viśvāmitra, Atri, Bharadvāja, Gautama, Kaśyapa and Vasishṭha. But, according to the Vāyu Purāṇa, the Seven Ṛishis are Bhṛigu, Marīchi, Atri, Aṅgiras, Pulastya, Pulaha, Kratu and Vasishṭha. Thus, while enumerating the Seven Ṛishis, the Vāyu Purāṇa has mentioned eight Ṛishis, and all of them are described as the mind-born sons of the Creator. In the first Adhyāya of Manu-Smṛiti there are given ten mind-born sons of Brahmā. According to the Purāṇas, the Seven Ṛishis were derived

15 Pravara-Mañjarī, p. 7.

16 Ṛig. X—82—2, X—109-4.

from the different parts of the body of the Creator—Bhṛigu from his skin, Marīchi from his mind, and so on. Quite a wonderful description is given of the origin of Bhṛigu and Aṅgiras in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa. Prajāpati was enamoured of his daughter. The result of Prajāpati's lust was the dropping of his semen which flew on the ground. The semen was heated by gods. The spark which blazed up first from Prajāpati's semen was Āditya, the second spark became Bhṛigu who was subsequently adopted by Varuṇa; the coals of the semen were the Aṅgiras, and the coals which were extinguished and blazed again became Bṛihaspati[17]. What principally concerns us here is that the denotation of the word 'Saptarshi' is not constant, and their origin is a matter of speculation with the various Purāṇas and Brāhmaṇas.

It may be contended against what has been said up to this time that, after all, mythology is mythology, and a critical accuracy and consistency, quite essential in history, is not to be expected in the realm of mythology. Nobody would disagree with this view. Mythology is mythology no doubt; but when a historian like Mr. Vaidya tries to establish from the gotras an unbroken line of descent on the authority of mythology, it becomes necessary to examine mythology critically and to prove that no historical deductions can be derived from it. I have tried to point out so far that even mythology has not been properly followed by Mr. Vaidya. His theory, that originally there were only four gotras Vasishṭha, Bhṛigu, Kaśyapa and Aṅgiras, and the four Ṛishis were the progenitors of the first three classes of the Indo-Aryans, and Agastya was a later addition, and Atri was the last addition to the gotras of the Indo-Aryans, is contradicted from all sides; and it cannot

17 A. Brāhmaṇa, 3-34; Haug, pp. 219, 220.

stand. Now remains to see how the Mahābhārata passage and Baudhāyana's dictum are to be interpreted so that they should not contradict each other. In the Mahābhārata passage the word gotra means pravara, and I have tried hereafter to prove that different pravaras are the different schools of rituals. Thus, what the Mahābhārata quotation really means is that originally there were four schools of rituals, and later on they developed into many. In the Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, the word 'samānagotra' has been rendered as 'samānārsheya' i. e. samāna-pravara, by the commentator Nārāyaṇa; and in the same way the author of Pravara-Mañjarī has paraphrased the word 'sagotra', used by Baudhāyana in his pravarādhyāya as 'samānapravara'[18]. Thus, the writer of the Mahābhārata has nothing to say about the origin of the first three classes of the Indo-Aryans; but he simply wants to say that originally there were only four schools of thought or rituals going under the names of Bhṛigu, Aṅgiras, Kaśyapa and Vasishṭha. Professor Zimmer would like to go still back. He argues that originally there was only one gotra, namely, the Bhṛiguaṅgiras (combined) and it was a synonym for the whole Brahmin class. Bhṛiguaṅgiras are styled as gods in Vedic literature. They competed with the gods and ascended the heavens[19].

Identity of Gotra and Surname

Having so far discussed Mr. Vaidya's views about gotra, let us try to see what information we can have directly from Vedic literature. In the Ṛigveda, the word 'gotra' happens to occur six times; but nowhere it means a family or family name. In four places it

18 Pravara-Mañjarī, p. 137.

19 "Studien Zur Geschichte Der Gotras", pp. 40, 41, 42.

means either a cloud, or a mountain[20]; while, in two other places, it means a herd[21]. Roth interpretes the word as cow's stall, while Geldner thinks that gotra means a herd[22]. We may infer that the word 'gotra' in the Ṛigveda times, though it did not imply the later sense of family, was slowly gathering around it the idea of a group. The word definitely came to mean a family in the Chhāndogya Upanishad where Gautama questioned Satyakāma Jābāla, a young boy who approached him for education, to what gotra he belonged[23]. Here, gotra exactly means a family name. We may gather that between the Ṛigveda period and the period of the Chhāndogya Upanishad, the word 'gotra' assumed its normal meaning i.e. family or family name, though it had nothing to do with the artificial meaning that Baudhāyana attributed to it. Baudhāyana himself declares that there are thousands and millions and multimillions of gotras or family names. Disregarding some details, we may say that the innumerable gotras or family names very nearly approached the surnames in the modern societies. The word 'gotra' has been used as a synonym, for the surname in the Mahābhārata[24] and in the Kauṭilīya[25].

How did these millions and millions of gotras or family names come into existence? In the beginning of the Vedic period we do not find any direct reference to these family names; while, in course of time, they become innumerable. The reason is obvious. As long as the population of a place is very limited

20 Ṛig. VI—17-2, IX—86-23, X—48-2, X—120-8.

21 Ṛig. VI—65-5, X—103-7.

22 V. Index, Vol. I. p. 235.

23 Chhāndogya Upanishad, II—4.

24 Ādiparva, 75-10.

25 Kauṭilīya (Jolly's edition), III—1-19.

and that small population also is cut off from the rest of the world, denotation of individuals is quite satisfactorily done by personal names. But, when the population increases, when isolation disappears, and when the intercourse between man and man, province and province, becomes more intensive and extensive, personal names can no longer suffice the needs of the society. Corporate life necessarily requires a fuller description to denote the same person; and that is done by adding the father's name to the son's name. Sometimes the name of the locality is added. As time rolls on, the personal name of the father, sometimes unchanged, and sometimes with some variations, becomes the surname or gotra for the descendants. In English—Jones, Thomson, Williams, Richardson—such surnames are clearly formed from the fathers' personal names. On examining the list of gotras we find a large number, belonging to the patronymic type. Sometimes the gotra is formulated from the unmodified patronymic name, but more often with suitable changes in the body of the word. Thus, from the patronymic name Kaṇva, we get the following gotras—Kaṇva, Kaṇvi, Kāṇva and Kāṇvāyana. Most of the known gotras of the Brahmins are patronymic in their origin. But, at the same time, there are several gotras referring to particular locality in which the person or persons lived; just as Gāndhāra (a resident of the Gāndhāra province), Pāñchāla (a resident of Pāñchāla), Khāṇḍava, (a resident of the Khāṇḍava forest), Mātsya (a resident of Matsya province), Mālya (a resident of Māla province), Mādhyameya (a resident of mid-land), Gāṅgī (residing on the Ganges,) Godāyana (residing on the banks of the Godā river), Saindhava (a resident of Sindh), Veśya (living on the frontier), etc. Different occupations of people, ecclesiastic or otherwise, are responsible

for several gotra-names such as Chhandoga (a singer of the Vedas), Meshapa (one who rears goats), Yājñika (the performer of a sacrifice), Yajñavāha (the leader of the sacrifice), Hotā (a priest), Prāchārya (a very learned teacher), Somapeya (a drinker of Soma), Somayāga (performer of the Soma sacrifice), Gāyaka (a singer), Netā (a leader), Pāchaka (a cook), Rājasevaka (a servant of the king) etc. Finally, there are gotras, formed from nick-names such as Kāṇākshi (having a blind eye), Kapimukha (monkey-faced), Mauna (dumb), Gardhabha (an ass), Gardhabhī-mukha (ass-faced), Mahodara (having a big belly), Ulūka (an owl), Kāmi (lustful), Tanukarṇa (having small ears), Śaṭha (a villain), Madhupa (a drinker of honey), Yamadūta (a messenger of death), Gaura (white or fair-coloured), Kṛishṇa (black-coloured), Jvari (feverish), Jimhaśūnya (free from craft), Godveshi (a hater of the cow), Tailakeśi (having greasy hair) etc.

From my investigations in Mahārāshṭra, I have been as yet able to collect fourteen cases in the Brahmin community where the surname of a person and the name of his gotra are identical. These families still repeat the same pravaras, as they did in Sūtra times. The fourteen surnames are as follows :—

1 Parāśara was a gotra Ṛishi. At present Parāśare is a surname current among the Brahmins. The gotra of Parāśare is Parāśara.

2 Dattātreya is a gotra Ṛishi. Datte is a surname among the Karhāḍā Brahmins. The family belongs to Atri-gaṇa.

3 Gāndhārāyaṇa was a gotra Ṛishi. He belonged to the Bharadvāja-gaṇa. Gāndhāre is a surname among the Chitpāvan Brahmins. The gotra of the family is Bharadvāja.

4 Ṛishi is the name of a gotra belonging to the Viśvāmitra-gaṇa. Ṛishi is a surname among the Deśastha Brahmins, and the gotra of the family is Viśvāmitra.

5 Atri is a gotra Ṛishi. Atre is a surname among the Deśastha Brahmins. The gotra of the Atres is Atri.

6 Agasti is a gotra Ṛishi. Agasti is a surname among the Deśastha Brahmins. The gotra of the family is Agastya.

7 Chandrātreya is a gotra Ṛishi. Among the Śukla Yajurvedī Brahmins, Chandrātreya is a surname. The gotra of the family is Chandrātreya.

8 Piṅga is a gotra Ṛishi belonging to the Bharadvāja-gaṇa. Piṅge is a surname among the Karhāḍā Brahmins, and the gotra of the family is Bharadvāja.

9 Paiṅgala was a gotra Ṛishi belonging to Kevala Aṅgiras-gaṇa. Piṅgḷe is a surname among the Deśastha Brahmins. Piṅgḷes belong to Kevala Aṅgiras-gaṇa.

10 Śrotriya is a gotra Ṛishi belonging to the Kevala Bhṛigu-gaṇa. Śrotriya is a surname belonging to the Deśastha Brahmins. Śrotriyas belong to Bhṛigu-gaṇa.

11 Khaṇḍa is the name of a gotra Ṛishi belonging to Kaśyapa-gaṇa. Khāṇḍekar is a surname among the Karhāḍā Brahmnis. The gotra of the family is Kaśyapa.

12 Haridra is a gotra Ṛishi belonging to Kevala Aṅgiras-gaṇa. Haḷdye or Haḷdyo is a surname among the Karhāḍā Brahmins.

Haḷdyes belong to Kevala Aṅgiras-gaṇa. As is apparent, both the words are derived from Haridrā.

13 Kauṇḍiṇya is a gotra Ṛishi belonging to Vasishṭha-gaṇa. Kauṇḍiṇya is a surname among the Sārasvata Brahmins, and the gotra of the family is Kauṇḍiṇya.

14 Garga is a gotra Ṛishi. Garge is a surname among the Deśastha Brahmins. The gotra of the family is Gārgya.

Among the Bhuīnhār Brahmins of U.P. names of several Ṛishis are used as surnames even now, such as Garga, Gautama, Śaṇḍilya, Pāṭhaka, Kauśika, Bharadvāja etc.[26]

Thus, it will be seen that at one time gotra and surname were identical terms, and there is a rational explanation for the appearance of millions of different gotras in ancient India. Among the ancient Greeks and Romans, with the rise of population and the growth of civilization and communication, the need of fuller connotation to denote a person was felt, and we find such expressions as 'Dionysius the Tyrant' and 'Socrates, the son of Sophtonicus'; while the Romans had to go a step further, and a Roman citizen had a threefold name as 'Marcus Tullius Cicero.' The first was the personal name, the second was the clan name, and the third was the surname. Among the Southern Slavs, a man was known as 'Jovo Petra (father) Markova (grand-father) Jankovica (house community) Kovacevica (clan).'[27] With the Norman conquest and the consequent social and political growth of England, surnames

26 W. Crooke, Vol. II. p. 68.

27 Schrader, "Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan People," translated by Jevons (1890), p. 397.

came into use; and all of them are either patronymic, occupational, local or nick-names.[28]

The gotras, as explained in the last four paragraphs, have nothing to do with the idea of gotra as explained by Baudhāyana. Baudhāyana does not view gotra as an independent factor, but treats gotra as solely dependant upon pravaras. The current practice among the Brahmins is to determine the gotra on considering its accepted pravaras. So, we shall have to consider at this stage the problem of the pravaras; but it might be repeated with much propriety that the gotras, when they originated among the Brahmins, must have very much resembled the surnames of modern societies.

In his article on 'Gotra' in the Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics[29], Dr. Fick has expressed the opinion that at least some of the Brahmanical gotras have a totemic origin, because they are named after animals or plants. By way of illustration he mentions certain gotras such as Matsya (a fish), Aja (a goat), Kaśyapa (a tortoise), Kauṇḍiṇya (a monkey), Kapi (a monkey) etc. It is true, no doubt, that a few of the Brahmanical gotras are named after plants and animals; but it does not at all follow from it that the Brahmanical gotras are totemic in their origin. In totemic septs, it is not the name of the sept that counts; but the essential thing in totemism is the superstitious belief, held by each member of the sept that he is intimately related to his totem. "The connection between a man and his totem is mutually beneficent; the totem protects the man, and the man shows his respect for the totem in various ways, by not killing it if it be an animal, and not cutting or gathering it

28 Bardsley, "Our English Surnames," p. 8.

29 Ency. of Religion and Ethics, Vol. 6 (1913), p. 358.

if it be a plant[30]." Gotras mentioned by Fick or any other Brahmanical gotras do not entertain any such superstitious beliefs. Certain trees like the banyan, fig, pipal etc., are no doubt worshipped in India, but the worship is not confined to any particular gotra or community. Certain trees are respected and worshipped from one corner of India to the other. The same may be said about the monkey-god Hanumān. Hanumān-worship is not the cult of any particular caste or community; but Hanumān is universally recognized as the representative deity of muscular strength. In the English society we find such surnames as Bird, Bull, Cane, Cock, Eagle, Hare, Heron, Lilley, Peach, Rose, Silk, Whale, Wolf etc.; but it will be certainly ridiculous to argue from these names that the English society is not free from totemic influences. As I have already mentioned, such family names are based upon nicknames; and they have nothing to do with totemic superstitions.

Before proceeding, we must try, if possible, to find some satisfactory reasons for the almost entire disappearance, in the modern society, of the innumerable gotras—the surnames of the Brahmins. One of the obvious reasons is the long intervening period, covering at least three thousand years; but a more potent reason, I venture to suggest, for the elimination of the ancient Brahmanical surnames. As will be shown in the fourth chapter, innumerable gotras or surnames were grouped under ten heads on the basis of the pravaras, the most conspicuous names being selected for the purpose. The ten gotras and their major subdivisions were covered in a spiritual glory and the rest of the innumerable gotras were subordinated to them. The Brahmin was taught to think of his spiritual gotra to the neglect of his individual gotra or surname. In course of time, only

30 Frazer, Vol. I. pp. 3, 4.

the sanctified few gotras remained, while the ordinary gotras or ancient surnames, a vast majority of which was patronymic, slowly disappeared from the field, and new surnames were introduced. Mr. Rājavāde has shown that many family names or surnames, mentioned in the Mahābhārata, are still current in the Maratha community in Mahārāshṭra;[31] but in that case, it is necessary to remember that there is no record of any artificial organization of the Maratha community in which a few patronymic surnames were given prominence and the rest were subordinated to them.

---

31 "Itihāsa Saṅgraha," a Marathi Monthly Magazine, Vol. II 4th issue, p. 22.

CHAPTER III

PRAVARA

Pravara as explained by the Sūtra-writers

What is a pravara? None of the various Kalpa-Sūtra-writers has made any attempt to define the word precisely, though all of them have given exhaustive details of various pravaras. The commentators of the Sūtras have tried to explain the subject as best as they could understand it. The sum total of the commentators' explanations of the pravaras may be best given in the words of Max Müller: "When the fire is to be consecrated, Agni, Havyavāhana—the god who carries the libations to heavens must be invoked......... This invitation or invocation is called Pravara. Agni himself or fire is called Ārsheya—the offspring of the Ṛishis, because the Ṛishis first lighted him at their sacrifices —He is the Hotṛi as well as the Adhvaryu among the gods. Like the Hotṛi and Adhvaryu priests, he is supposed to invite the gods to the sacrifice, and to carry himself the oblation to the seat of the immortals. When a Brahmin, therefore, has his own fire consecrated, he wishes to declare that he is as worthy as his ancestors to offer sacrifice, and he invites Agni to carry his oblations to the gods, as he did for his ancestors. The names of these ancestors must then be added to his invitation, and thus the invitation or invocation of the ancestors came to be called Pravaras.[1]"

Mr. Vaidya also, trying to prove that the pravara Ṛishis are the ancestors of the gotra Ṛishis, so proceeds with the pravara discussion. The study of the Pravarādhyāyas of several Sūtras discloses the fact that pravara Ṛishis are the ancestors in one's family, who

1 Max Müller, pp. 198, 199.

composed the hymns of the Ṛigveda and who have praised Agni by those hymns. The sacrificer, in reciting the pravaras, is supposed to pray to Agni, and to tell him that he is the descendant of the Ṛishis who have praised him by their hymns in the Ṛigveda. Ṛishi, as a matter of fact, means a composer of the Ṛigveda hymns. A gotra Ṛishi may be or may not be a composer of the Ṛigveda hymns. Gotras are innumerable, but pravaras are few; because the number of the hymn-composers is a fixed one. The gotra Ṛishi is one of the pravara Ṛishis, or he is the descendant of the pravara Ṛishis. The Sūtras declare that the Adhvāryu priest should recite the names of the pravara Ṛishis in the order of the ascent, while the Hotṛi is to recite them according to the order of the descent. This further means that gotra and pravara indicate descent and not discipleship[2].

So, both Max Müller and Mr. Vaidya are supporters of the theory that the pravara system shows a regular and trustworthy descent. In his introduction to 'Gotrāpravaranibandhakadambam,' Mr. P. Chentsalrao also has expressed views similar to those of Mr. Vaidya[3]. My own view is opposed to the theory of descent, and I can see nothing more than formal discipleship in the pravaras.

I will now turn to how the authors of the Sūtras and their commentators treat the subject. Satra is a kind of sacrifice, where all the officiating priests successively play the role of Yajamāna (sacrificer). It is in connection with these Satras that the Sūtra-writers describe the pravaras. The second Sūtra of Āpastamba in the pravarakāṇḍa is "Ārsheyam Vṛiṇīte." Kapar-

---

2 "History of Mediaeval Hindu India", Vol. II. pp. 57, 58.

3 P. Chentsalrao, introduction, p. 1.

disvāmin, the commentator, interpretes the Sūtra in two ways: (1) He tells his connection with the Ṛishis; (2) He invokes the fire, the offspring of the Ṛishis, the sacrificer himself being a descendant of the same Ṛishi[4].

Thus, it will be seen that the commentator is not sure as to which of the two senses is correct. Both the senses cannot be true at one and the same time. Subsequent Sūtras of Āpastamba clearly show that neither the Sūtra-writer nor the commentator has any definite idea as to the two words 'Ārsheyam Vṛiṇīte'. Āpastamba continues, "He chooses his Ārsheya with Ṛishis but neither with men nor gods. He chooses three Ṛishis—the composers of Vedic hymns—the composers that may belong to his family. The Adhvaryu is to recite the Ārsheyas in the order of the ascent, and the Hotṛi is to recite the pravaras in the order of the descent[5]." With such brief introduction the Sūtra-writer proceeds to the details of the pravaras.

Relying on the Sūtra-writers, Mr. Vaidya maintains that the sacrificer recites the names of those Ṛishis who are his ancestors and who composed the Ṛigveda hymns. Here, two things are presumed, namely, that we possess the accurate knowledge as to who composed the Ṛigveda hymns, and further the sacrificer remembers his ancestry perfectly from almost immemorial times. Both these things, being very important, cannot be simply presumed. They must be proved by unquestionable evidence. For the first statement, there is at least a shadow of evidence; for the latter there is none.

Untrustworthy Records of the Sarvānukramaṇi

In the Ṛigveda itself we have very little positive evidence to determine the authorship of different hymns.

4 P. Chentsalrao, p. 302.
5 P. Chentsalrao, pp. 302, 303, 304.

It is very rare that the composer of the hymn directly mentions his name. In a collection of one thousand and odd hymns, there are less than one score cases where the composer's name is mentioned or can be inferred from the references in the hymn. Mr. Vaidya offers the evidence of the Sarvānukramaṇī of Kātyāyana to prove that the pravara Ṛishis are the authors of the Ṛigveda hymns. He himself has compared the names of pravara Ṛishis with the names in the Anukramaṇī, and he vouchsafes that they agree. It is a fact, no doubt, that Kātyāyana gives the Ṛishi or the composer for each hymn, the metre of the hymn, as well as the deity or the subject matter of the hymn. Kātyāyana not only gives us the name of the Ṛishi, but even his gotra or family name. The question, however, remains whether the Anukramaṇī is a faithful record. Kātyāyana is a contemporary of Āśvalāyana, the famous author of the Kalpa Sūtra, and Macdonell has shown that the middle of the fourth century before Christ is the probable date of Kātyāyana[6]. Thus, a considerable period passed between the composition of the Ṛigveda hymns and the days of the Anukramaṇī. In the absence of any direct evidence to attribute a hymn to a particular author, the very long time, that intervened between the Ṛigveda period and the Anukramaṇī period, raises a very strong presumption against the correctness of the statements, made by the Anukramaṇī.

The author of the Anukramaṇī, having undertaken the task of supplying an author to each hymn, often finds himself completely ignorant of facts; and then he has to resort to the invention of fabulous authors of the hymns. Thus, Kātyāyana has been compelled to attribute the authorship of some of the hymns to

6 "Preface to the Sarvanukramaṇī", p. viii.

Agni, Varuṇa, Soma, Speech, Prajāpati, Parameshṭhī, Indra, Indrāṇī and so on. As it will be the height of credulity to believe that all these authors were historical personages, it very naturally follows that, where Kātyāyana was at a loss to put in any other suitable name, he has put forth manifestly fabulous persons. It may be argued that such doubtful cases, or rather cases where Kātyāyana's information amounts to almost nil, are very few; and his other statements may be taken as correct. But this also will not stand, because Kātyāyana does not quote any reliable authority for his statements. In fact, he has nothing to fall back upon except the idle tradition of the Brāhmaṇa works. Often times Kātyāyana assigns the authorship to one man, and then doubting his own information, supplements it by adding another name. Sometimes three and four names are given as joint authors[7]. Again, from very ancient days, disputes as to who composed a hymn and who gave publicity to it were going on. The dispute as to the real authorship of certain hymns between Vāmadeva and Viśvāmitra is narrated in Aitareya Brāhmaṇa[8]. The hymns in question were the work of Viśvāmitra; but it was Vāmadeva who gave publicity to the hymns; and so the latter was considered the composer of the hymns. The doubting mentality, which is betrayed by the author's mind when he suggests two, three or four names of composers, speaks very strongly against the authenticity of the information supplied by the Anukramaṇī.

A stronger proof for the contention that those in whose names the hymns stand according to Anukramaṇī did not actually compose the hymns, may be offered. The whole of the seventh Maṇḍala of the Ṛigveda is

7 Ṛig. X-57, X-72, X-179, X-181.

8 A. Brāhmaṇa, 6-18; Haug, pp. 406, 407.

attributed to Vasishṭha and his sons. Thirty-third hymn in this Maṇḍala which has been already referred to in the previous chapter is partly attributed to Vasishṭha and partly to his sons. According to Anukramaṇī, in the first nine verses Vasishṭha praises his sons who form the deity of the verses, and in the remaining five verses the sons of Vasishṭha are the seers or the composers, and Vasishṭha is the deity of the verses; and what a wonderful praise the sons have offered to their revered father ! They graphically describe the absurd story of the seed of Mitra and Varuṇa being deposited in the pot, and Vasishṭha and Agastya coming out from it. As the story of Vasishṭha's birth is a fable on the face of it, it follows that Vasishṭha's sons were in the dark as to the origin of their father, and Vasishṭha who opens the hymn nods his assent to the whole by praising his own sons in the first nine verses. The whole affair—Vasishṭha himself ignorant of his origin, and he and his sons both glorying in that ignorance, and both recording it in a hymn—strikes very strange to the ear, and if it leads to any inference, it is that the said hymn is neither the composition of Vasishṭha nor his sons. To quote one more instance, in the fourth Maṇḍala Trasadasyu is the composer of hymn No. 42, according to the Anukramaṇī. In it Trasadasyu is declaring that he himself, who is nothing short of a demi-god, and is valiant like Indra, was offered to his mother by the Seven Ṛishis, while his father lay in imprisonment. Here also, we are asked to believe that Trasadasyu is advertising his very obscure descent, and is all the while boasting of his greatness.

What we can gather from all this is that Kātyāyana had no definite knowledge as to who were the respective composers of the hymns. In the absence of any historical information, it was really impossible for him to prepare a list of the composers of the Ṛigveda hymns.

But he did undertake the impossible task. Having committed himself to supply a composer for each hymn, he had to fabricate names, and as has been already pointed out,—Yama, Varuṇa, Soma, Vivasvān, Āditya—such names appear as the composers of hymns. Kātyāyana's criterion of determining the authorship of a hymn is 'Yasya Vākyam sa Ṛishiḥ (He whose speech is in the hymn is the composer). But the difficulty or the impossibility is how to determine whose vākya is the particular hymn. Often it happens that the authorship is offered to one whose name is found in the hymn in any connection whatsoever. The dictum has led in certain cases to strange results. Thus, in the famous conversation between Yama and Yamī, the verses embodying Yamī's exhortations to Yama are attributed to the composer Yamī, while the verses that give us the firm reply made by Yama are assigned to the composer Yama. As is quite obvious, the conversation between Yama and Yamī has been recorded by some one else. But Kātyāyana, because of his ignorance of definite facts and because of his dictum "Yasya Vākyam Sa Ṛishiḥ," has been compelled to put in the names of Yama and Yamī as the composers of the respective verses. A similar anomaly is found in the ninty-fifth hymn of the tenth maṇḍala. The hymn records the dialogue between Purūravas and Urvaśī. Kātyāyana, according to his dictum, has to declare that Purūravas is the composer of some verses and Urvaśī is the deity. As regards the remaining verses of the hymn, Urvaśī is the composer and Purūravas is the deity. Thus, the authorship of the Ṛigveda hymns, as described in the Sarvānukramaṇī, cannot be considered at all a faithful record. On the other hand, it would be reasonable to conclude that the author, trying to perform an impossible task, had deliberately to supplement his information by fiction.

Pravara Ṛishi is not necessarily a composer of the Ṛigveda hymns

The next question is, are all the pravara Ṛishis, as enumerated in the pravara-Kāṇḍas, the authors of the Ṛigveda hymns as recorded by the Sarvānukramaṇī? This is a question of actual reference and not of argument. In the Bhṛigu gaṇa, Āpnavāna, Anūpa, Mitrayuvan, Śaṭhara, Māṭhara etc. are the pravara Ṛishis, but are not the authors of the Ṛigveda hymns. Similarly, in the Aṅgiras gaṇa, Aṅgiras, Somarājaka, Pṛishadaśva, Bida, Divodāsa, Kareṇupāla, Raghu, Saṅkṛiti, Śaiṅga, Śaiśiri, etc; in the Viśvāmitra gaṇa, Śalaṅkāyana, Kaṭhaka, Krathaka, Devatarasa, Dhanañjaya, Aja, Rohiṇa, Vadhūla, Udala, etc; in the Atri gaṇa, Pūrvātithi, Putrika, Sumaṅgala etc.; in the Kaśyapa gaṇa, Śāṇḍilya; in the Vaśishṭha gaṇa, Mitrāvaruṇa and Kuṇḍina; and in the Agastya gaṇa, Sambavāha, Hemodaka, Pūrṇamāsa, Hemavarcha, etc. are pravara Ṛishis; but the Anukramaṇī does not recognize them as the mantrakṛits or the composers of the Ṛigveda hymns.

So far two things have been proved; first, that the information, supplied by the Anukramaṇī, is far from being trustworthy; and secondly, granting that it is trustworthy, the pravara Ṛishis as given in different Sūtras are not necessarily the authors of the Ṛigveda hymns; or rather we may say that a large number of pravara Ṛishis are not the hymn composers. At the same time there are a lot of mantrakṛits or hymn-composers who are not pravaras. Thus, the assertion of Mr. Vaidya that the pravara Ṛishis are the composers of Vedic hymns cannot hold its ground.

Next we shall have to examine the second point of Mr. Vaidya, namely, that the pravara Ṛishis are the ancestors of the sacrificer. Max Müller and other orienta-

lists are inclined to take a similar view of the problem, though perhaps they are not as emphatic in their statements as Mr. Vaidya. In such cases, where one makes a bold and comprehensive assertion, the burden of proving that statement naturally must fall upon him. Mr. Vaidya has, however, brought absolutely no evidence to prove such an important statement. He asserts and reasserts his statement, and expects his readers to believe him. What may be considered as the evidence to prove that pravara system is based upon descent is nothing beyond two or three passages from Taittirīya Saṁhitā and Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa. All the Sūtra-writers and their commentators have quoted from the Taittirīya Saṁhitā: "He chooses one of a Ṛishi's family; verily he departs not from the connection; (and so it serves) for continuity. He chooses, beginning at the further end, in order of descent; therefore the pitṛis drink after men in order of descent, beginning at the further end[9]." The second passage is from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa: "He chooses from the remotest end downwards; for it is from the remote end downwards that a race is propogated. Thereby he also propitiates the Lord of Seniority. For, here, among men, the father comes first, then the son, and then the grandson. This is the reason why he chooses from the remotest end downwards[10]." In these two passages the idea of descent may be traced by superficial observers, but as will be proved in the next chapter, the words, grandson, son and father, are used in the text only by way of illustration. They are not to be understood literally.

Order of the Pravaras does not support the Theory of Descent

By the examination of different pravaras, let us see whether they support the theory of descent. The

9 T. Saṁhitā, II-5-8; Keith, p. 198.

10 Ś. Brāhmaṇa, 1-5-1-10; S. B. E. Vol. XII. pp. 133, 134.

pravaras, assigned to the Kuṇḍina gotra, are Vasishṭha, Mitrāvaruṇa and Kuṇḍina. Here Mitrāvaruṇa is the most senior, and Kuṇḍina is the most junior. So, in Kuṇḍina gotra neither the order of the descent or ascent is followed. In Viśvāmitra gaṇa, with Aghamarshaṇa gotra, the pravaras are Viśvāmitra, Aghamarshaṇa and Kuśika. Here, Aghamarshaṇa is the grandson of Viśvāmitra, and no systematic arrangement is kept in arranging the pravara names. Again in the same gaṇa with the sub-division Kuśika, the pravaras are Viśvāmitra, Devarāta and Udala; and all these names belong to the descendants of Kuśika and not to the ascendants. Lohitas who also embrace the Viśvāmitra gaṇa have the two alternative pravaras, namely, 'Viśvāmitra, Ashṭaka, Lohita' or 'Viśvāmitra, Lohita Ashṭaka'. Here we are at a loss to understand whether it is the order of descent or the order of ascent that is maintained. If we look to the Gautama gaṇa, we shall be confronted with an anomaly which will dash to pieces the hypothesis that pravaras represent three successive generations. With the following four sub-divisions of Gautama gaṇa namely, Uchatha, Vāmadeva, Rāhugaṇa and Bṛihaduktha, the opening pravara is Aṅgiras. The closing pravara is uniformly Gautama; while the intervening pravara in each case is Uchatha, Vāmadeva, Rāhugaṇa and Bṛihaduktha in order. Here we are driven to the absurd conclusion that, while Aṅgiras is the common ancestor if not the father of the four sons or gotras, Gautama is the common descendant or son of all the four persons, namely, Uchatha, Vāmadeva, Rāhugaṇa and Bṛihaduktha or vice versa. Besides, according to the theory of ascent or descent, the gotra Ṛishi's name must appear either at the beginning or at the end of the pravaras. But, as in the present case, it can never appear mid-way. The pravaras of the Bhāradvāja gotra are

Bharadvāja, Bṛihaspati and Aṅgiras. Mr. Vaidya has expressed the opinion that Bharadvāja is the grandson of Aṅgiras; and it follows that Bṛihaspati is the father of Bharadvāja. In Aitareya Bṛahmaṇa we are, however, told that Bṛihaspati was not the son of Aṅgiras, but, so to say, was his brother, in as much as, both of them were born from the burnt sperm of Prajāpati. Thus, Bṛihaspati and Aṅgiras represent the same generation. Many such flagrant inaccuracies can be shown to vitiate the dictum that pravaras are based upon the line of descent.

To prove blood relationship of the pravara Ṛishis with the Yajamāna is really an impossible task. Nārāyaṇa, the commentator of Āśvalāyana, is very frank on this point. The Śruti tells us, the commentator proceeds, that one should recite the names of his hymn-composing ancestors. That these Ṛishis belong to one's family and among them the particular ones are the hymn-composers, is to be believed solely on the authority of Śruti and Smṛiti. There is no direct knowledge of it. People remember what gotra they belong to. Thus, they say that they belong to Vatsa, Bida or Kauṇḍiṇya gotra. But nobody remembers or independently knows what Ṛishis of his family composed Vedic hymns[11]. Thus, in determining the pravaras or gotras, our sole guides are the authors of the Sūtras. Medhātithi, the famous commentator of Manu, has maintained the same sceptic attitude about the connection between gotra and pravara Ṛishis[12].

Original Denotation of Ārsheya

We have discussed the pravara problem so far as the Sūtra-writers and their commentators have understood it. But the fact is that neither the Sūtra-writers, nor

11 Ā. Ś. Sūtra, p. 873.
12 Medhātithi's commentary on "Manu. III-5".

their commentators, nor the modern writers who base their arguments upon them, have fully grasped the problem. Among the different explanations of the word 'Ārsheya', one, offered by Mr. Ghule, seems to be convincing and rational on the whole; and I have found myself in complete agreement with his line of argument on this point. In the Brāhmaṇas as well as the Sūtra-works, the word 'Ārsheya' has been used as synonymous with pravara, and the usual formula runs 'Ārsheyam Vṛiṇīte.' As we have already seen, Kapardisvāmin, Āpastamba's commentator, who is held in great reverence by later writers, has given two interpretations of the formula. Two explanations cannot be correct at the same time. What does the formula really mean? Kapardisvāmin has assigned two alternative senses to 'vṛiṇīte;' one is 'recites' and the other is 'chooses or begs[13].' Now, the root 'vṛi' is never known to mean to 'recite.' The usual sense of the word is to beg or to select or to choose. Professor Eggeling, in his translation of Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, has interpreted the word as to 'call'; but in the foot-note he adds that the literal meaning of the word is 'to choose[14].' The sense of reciting which is unsupported by any authority has been suggested by Kapardisvāmin alternatively, because he entertained doubt in his mind as to the exact interpretation of the word 'Ārsheya.' And with the proper understanding of the word, the pravara problem is easily solved. Ārsheya, originally an adjective, is used like a noun. Is it a noun in the masculine gender or is it a noun in the neuter gender? Eggeling takes it to be a noun in the masculine gender; but he thinks that others take it in the neuter gender, either as a noun or as an adjective. When the word is used in the accusative singular as is often done by several writers, we can-

13 P. Chentsalrao, p. 302.
14 S. B. E. Vol. XII. p. 115.

not make out the gender of the word as used by them. Āśvalāyana[15] uses the word in the masculine plural as Ārsheyān, while Kātyāyana[16] and Sāṅkhyāyana[17] Śrauta Sūtras use the word in the accusative plural as Ārsheyāṇi. What is then the gender and the sense of the word 'Ārsheya'? The commentator of Sāṅkhyāyana Sūtra clearly states that Ārsheyāṇi means the names of Ṛishis, but the etymology of the word does not sanction this meaning. The word occurs only once in the Ṛigveda in the ninth Maṇḍala and the verse runs thus:—

"Abhī no arsha divyā vasūni abhi viśvā pārthivā pūyamānaḥ

Abhi yena draviṇam aśnavāma abhi ārsheyam Jamadagnivannaḥ" IX—95-51

"While thou art being purified, Oh, Soma, send down upon us the wealth of Heaven and the wealth of the Earth. Send us down the Ārsheya like that of Jamadagni by which we shall be able to enjoy wealth." Sāyana has interpreted 'Ārsheya' as wealth that is worthy of the son of a Ṛishi or a mantra that is worthy of a Ṛishi. Here it will be seen that in spite of the alternative interpretations, given by Sāyana, the first is apparently preferable. This further determines the gender of the word which, we may see, is neuter. This shows that in the Ṛigveda times Ārsheya was a thing for which the poets of the Ṛigveda hymns aspired, and while praying for the Ārsheya, they qualified it by connecting their desired Ārsheya with the name of some great sage. In the present case, the composer of the hymn is asking for an Ārsheya of the type which Jamadagni attained in former days. The termination 'vat' used after each pra-

15 Ā. Ś. Sūtra, 1-3-1.
16 Kā. Ś. Sūtra, 3-2-7, 3-2-9.
17 Sā. Ś. Sūtra, 1-4-15.

vara name is very significant, and that termination, properly understood, would lead to an easy and natural solution of the problem. Just as the hymn-composers asked for an Ārsheya, resembling that of some great sage, so, the Vedic writers, while invoking the fire, or while choosing the Agni for their Hotṛi, mention the names of great Ṛishis, and add the termination 'vat' implying thereby that they are following the great sages. The following passages from the Ṛigveda will show us how the practice of invoking Agni or choosing him for the Hotṛi after the fashion of great Ṛishis was current in the Ṛigveda times.

1 Manushvat agne Aṅgirasvat Aṅgiro Yayātivat sadane pūrvavat śuche

Achchha Yāhi āvahā daivyam janam āsādaya barhishi yakshi cha priyam I–31–17.

2 Priyamedhavat Atrivat Jātavedo Virūpavat

Aṅgirasvat Mahivrata Praskaṇvasya śrudhī havam I-45-3.

3 Agne tava tyat ukthyam deveshu asti āpyam

Sa naḥ satto Manushvat ā devān yakshi vidushṭaro vittam me asya rodasī I-105-13.

4 Manushvat tvā ni dhīmahi Manushvat samidhīmahi

Agne Manushvat Aṅgiro devān devayate yaja V-21-1.

5 Evendrāgnibhyām Pitṛivannabravīyo Mandhātṛivat Aṅgirasvat avāchi

Tridhātunā Śarmaṇā pātamasmān vayam syāma patayo rayīṇām VIII-40-12.

6 Uta tvā Bhṛiguvat śuche Manushvat Agna āhutaḥ

Aṅgirasvat havāmahe VIII-43-13.

7 Yam tvā janāsa indhate Manushvat Aṅgirastama

Agne sa bodhi me vachaḥ VIII-43-27.

In all these places, while invoking Agni or while establishing Agni or while requesting him to do something, the poet quotes one, two or three names of Ṛishis by way of standard of comparision. There are several more cases, where the termination 'vat' has not been actually used; but words, meaning the same thing like Yathā, have been used[18].

In course of time, the meaning of the word Ārsheya was changed, and instead of meaning Ṛishi's glory, it came to mean a Ṛishi who had obtained such a glory. In Atharva Veda, the word 'Ārsheya' loses its old sense and appears in its new meaning. "I invite again and again the Ārsheya Ṛishis i.e. Ṛishis who are the possessors of the Ārsheya glory[19]." Again, in connection with a barren cow, a curse is pronounced upon one who refuses to give such a cow to the Ārsheya Ṛishis asking for it[20]. The word appears three or four times in the Atharva Veda[21]; but every time it is used in its new sense, namely, a sage endowed with Ārsheya *i. e.* Ṛishi's glory.

When the original meaning was lost sight of, the formula 'Ārsheyam Vṛiṇīte' was interpreted as the recitation of the names of the Ṛishis who had obtained that Ārsheya. And, even after the lapse of such a long time, the original meaning is betrayed by the termination 'vat' which is even now applied to each pravara Ṛishi's name.

18 Ṛig. VIII-5-25, VIII-36-7, VIII-37-7, VIII-38-9, VIII-52-1 etc.

19 Atharva Veda, 11-1-26.

20 Ibid. 12-4-12.

21 Ibid. 11-1-16, 11-1-25, 11-1-26, 12-4-12.

According to the present interpretation, no explanation can be given as to why the word Ārsheya should be in the neuter gender, and why it should be in the singular number, as most of the writers have treated it. The explanation is to be sought in the verse already quoted. Ārsheya, when it meant Ṛishi's glory, was in the neuter gender. It was also singular. In asking for his Ārsheya, the sacrificer chose such names of Ṛishis as he pleased, and further begged that the Ārsheya he sought shall be on the model of the Ārsheya, attained by these Ṛishis. When the number of Vedic rites and their scope increased, this tendency of doing things, just as the ancients might have done them, also increased, and instead of asking for Ārsheya of a particular Ṛishi, when in a sacrifice Agni was chosen Hotṛi, the sacrificer chose Agni a Hotṛi, just as the old Ṛishis chose him. And, in the practice of choosing Agni as a Hotṛi, just as the old sages had done, the formula 'Ārsheyam Vṛiṇīte' occurs in the Taittirīya Saṁhitā[22]; but evidently a change in the denotation of the word has taken place. The Ārsheya, sought in the Ṛigveda times, is no longer in requisition. The old word is still retained; but, as in old days, Vedic writers or sacrificers begged for Ārsheya like that of such and such a great sage, in Brāhmaṇa times sacrificers chose Agni, belonging to Ṛishis, Hotṛi. Just as the formula grew more and more popular, the original meaning was entirely overlooked, and Āsheya came to mean a Ṛishi, possessed of great powers—Ārsheya powers. So, finally, Āśvalāyana has turned the word into Ārsheyān and Kātyāyana and Sāṅkhyāyana have twisted it into Ārsheyāṇi. The Sūtra-writers do not seem to have any idea of the original sense of Ārsheya, while the writers of the Brāhmaṇa works, being nearer to the Ṛigveda

22 T. Saṁhitā, II-5-8.

times, have used the word in the neuter gender and in the singular number, just as we find it in the Ṛigveda.

Ārsheya was a matter of selection in the beginning

Thus far, it has been shown how the idea of choosing the Ārsheyas or pravaras arose. One thing more may be emphasised with regard to this Ārsheya selection. Just as in old times the poet sought the Ārsheya of any particular Ṛishi he liked, so in choosing Agni for Hotṛi, the sacrificer had the fullest liberty to choose whatever ancient Ṛishis he liked, for his standard of comparison. The very word 'pravara' from 'vṛi' to select, is suggestive of the free choice left to the sacrificer. In course of time, as it is quite natural, the free choice, exercised by each sacrificer, disappeared; and the whole work became stereo-typed. Among the Brahmins, there are hundreds of religious sects, based upon certain ceremonial dogmas, although the ceremonials themselves have fallen long since into disuse. But it may be very easily seen that, when Vedic rituals were in full swing, each Śākhā or sect had a practical meaning, and naturally enough, each individual had the right of free selection, regarding what Śākhā or school he should belong to. In the matter of pravara-selection also, a man could exercise the same right.

That there was a free selection of pravaras at one time may be seen from the fact that Āpastamba as well as his commentators have referred to a quotation from the Śruti[23].

"Ekam vṛiṇīte, dvau vṛiṇīte, trīn vṛiṇīte, na chaturo vṛiṇīte, na pañchāti vṛiṇīte." Here the sacrificer has been allowed to choose one pravara or two or three, but not four and not more than five. Āpastamba does not support this view; but the existence of such a Śruti and

23 P. Chentsalrao, p. 303.

its mention in the Āpastamba Sūtra beyond doubt prove that the practice of choosing one pravara was once current among the Brahmins. As Āpastamba has thought it necessary to introduce a Sūtra in his work pertaining to the practice of choosing one or two pravaras, we may be justified in inferring that even in Āpastamba's days, some people chose only one or two pravaras. The Mīmāṁsakas maintain that the selection of one pravara and two pravaras is only an anuvāda; while the vidhi or the proper course is the selection of three pravaras[24]. But one may see that the later view of the Mīmāṁsakas cannot disprove the proposition that at one time the sacrificer had the option of selecting one, two or three pravaras. The quotation given by Āpastamba further proves the development of the idea of pravara-selection. Beginning with the selection of one pravara, some enthusiasts went to the extent of choosing an indefinite number of pravaras; so the Śruti injunction against the selection of more than five pravaras.

24 P. Chentsalrao, p. 187.

CHAPTER IV

Connection between Gotra and Pravara

With the explanation of the pravaras, given in the previous chapter, it will be now convenient to see the connection between the gotras and pravaras. While discussing the gotra problem, I have shown that originally the word gotra had no religious sanctity about it. With the appearance of intense social life among the Indo-Aryans gradually arose thousands and millions of surnames styled gotras; and we have seen that there is nothing unnatural in it. Almost all societies of ancient and modern times have felt the necessity of introducing surnames. By a detailed analysis of the names of different gotras I have shown that the gotras of Brahmins are patronymic, matronymic, professional or local in their origin; while a few gotras are clearly based upon nicknames. In short, the old word gotra must not be confused with the gotra as understood and illustrated by Baudhāyana in later times. Two things are noteworthy about Baudhāyana's definition of gotra. He framed it after the Pāṇini's dictum 'Apatyam Pautra-Prabhṛiti Gotram.' Secondly, gotra does not appear to Baudhāyana's mind as an independent institution, but he considers it entirely dependent upon pravaras.

Thousands and millions of gotras are divided into ten main groups or gaṇas according to Baudhāyana[1]. It is the principal pravara that determines each group. In other words we may say that, according to Baudhāyana, though the ordinary gotras or surnames were innumerable, the spiritual gotra groups, based upon the pravaras, recited by each family or gotra, were ten only. In following the discussion of the gotra and pra-

1 Pravara-Mañjarī, pp. 11, 12.

vara problems, one must not lose sight of this fundamental difference between gotra in its narrow sense and gotra in its spiritual or technical sense. The word 'gotra' is almost invariably used in its spiritual or technical sense by the Sūtra-writers and Smṛiti-writers. Out of the ten spiritual divisions, seven divisions are attached to the Seven Ṛishis, the eighth division belongs to Agastya, while the ninth and the tenth divisions belong to Kevala Aṅgiras and Kevala Bhṛigu. I will consider later on what is meant by the prefix Kevala attached to the two divisions Aṅgiras and Bhṛigu. But, before that, one important question arises. At what time were the innumerable gotras grouped together on the basis of the pravaras? Is it Baudhāyana who did it? Or are we to trace such grouping to more ancient times ?

In the Ṛigveda, as we have already seen, the rigid gotra and pravara system did not exist. The word 'gotra' was slowly gathering round itself the sense of a family. But, it seems, that in the Ṛigveda period different schools of rituals were either already formed or were in the process of formation. We often find in the Ṛigveda such phrases as Vasiṣṭhāḥ, Kanvāḥ etc. They are either family names or names of different schools of rituals. That gotras and pravaras are not very ancient may be seen from the fact that in the very comprehensive rituals of the Vedic sacrifices very little importance is attached to gotras and pravaras. Such occasions, when the form of a ritual is determined according to the particular school to which the sacrificer belongs, are very few in number. One such occasion is the selection of Āprī verses. Āprīs are the propitiatory hymns at the animal sacrifice. By means of Āprīs certain minor divinities are invited and they are satisfied chiefly with butter. The first Brāhmaṇa work where

the Āprīs are mentioned is the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa in which occurs the sentence, 'He ought to repeat such Āprī verses as are traceable to a Ṛishi[2].' Now, in the Brāhmaṇa works, the various schools of Ṛishis have not been mentioned. But a verse has been quoted from Śaunaka by Nārāyaṇa, the commentator of Āśvalāyana, where the ten Āprī hymns are assigned to ten different gotras Kaṇva, Aṅgiras, Agastya, Śunaka Viśvāmitra, Atri, Vasishṭha, Kaśyapa, Vadhryaśva and Bhṛigu. Certain gotras must invoke Tanūnapāt, while others must choose, instead of this deity, the Nārāśaṁsa deity. This has been made clear by Āśvalāyana in his Śrauta-Sūtra[3]. Nārāśaṁsa is the special deity of Vasishṭha, Śunaka, Atri and Vadhryaśva, while others worship Tanūnapāt. Here, we will notice one thing clearly, namely, the choosing of Āprī verses depended upon a gaṇa or a group to which a person belonged; but the gaṇas that are mentioned in connection with the choosing of Āprīs are not the same as the gaṇas or groups given in the pravara-Kāṇḍas of the Sūtra-writers. In determining the order of the Āprī verses, Kaṇva, Śunaka and Vadhryaśva are counted as independent gaṇas; while in later times, Vadhryaśva and Śunaka are grouped under Kevala Bhṛigu; and Kaṇva, in later grouping, is counted among the Aṅgirasas. Thus, we may see that though from the days of the Sūtra-writers, there has been no change made in the various gaṇas and their constituent sub-gotras, the gotras were grouped at one time under different gaṇas. This is quite natural. When Vedic rituals were in full practice, and when Brahmanic lores and their dogmas were a living force, different gotras would determine for themselves to which group they should belong.

---

2 A. Brāhmaṇa, 2-4 ; Haug, p. 83.

3 Ā. Ś. Sūtra, 1-5-21.

In Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa every person is required to perform the Agnyādhāna with due attention to his separate deity. Then Bhṛigus and Aṅgirasas are recommended to perform their Ādhāna with the Mantra 'Bhrigūṇām Tvāṅgirasām Vratapate,' while other Brahmins are to perform the Ādhāna with the Mantra 'Ādityānām Tvā Devānām[4].' Here also, groups based upon Vedic rituals are indicated; but to cut the matter short only three groups are made—Bhṛigu, Aṅgiras and other Brahmin families combined. Prof. Zimmer is of opinion that the Bhṛiguaṅgiras was one group and the oldest group[5]. The different Āprī hymns, depending upon different gaṇas, are given in the Sūtra works and Brāhmaṇa works; but going back still further to Yajurveda, where the procedure of the Darśapūrṇamāsa and the animal sacrifice is given, different Āprīs for different gaṇas are not mentioned; but one Āprī is mentioned for all[6]. So, we may reasonably infer that the groups or gaṇas, each consisting of several sub-gotras, cannot be traced in the Yajurveda.

Thus, the grouping of gotras under certain heads which we fail to find in Yajurveda was originally made in the days of Brāhmaṇas and we find it almost stereotyped in Sūtra works. On what lines were these groups formed? Were they quite arbitrary or had they some basis? It has been already pointed out that each sacrificer on every important occasion of worship invoked the names of ancient Ṛishis, and tried to perform the rituals just as the ancients had done. This was alright as long as the sacrifice or fire-worship was an individual duty; but, when sacrifice developed into a

4 Tai. Brāhmaṇa, 1-1-4-8.
5 "Studien Zur Geschichte Der Gotras", p. 43.
6 T. Saṁhitā, III-1-3; Keith, p. 225.

science, it took a collective form, and Satras or communal sacrifices began to get popular; and this happened when individual fire-worship declined. With the introduction of Satras it became both necessary and convenient for the priest-craft to group all Brahmin families under certain heads. And what were the heads that they selected? The ten gaṇas or groups are formed by the usual Seven Ṛishis and Agastya, Bhṛigu and Aṅgiras. The ten divisions that were formed on the occasion of the Āprī-selection differ from the groups or gaṇas appearing in the Sūtra works. This will show us how the grouping process was going on for some time; and the latest and the revised edition of the grouping is the one recorded by the authors of the Sūtras. On examining the individual Ṛishis who formed the ten gaṇas, we notice that Viśvāmitra, Atri, Bharadvāja and Vasishṭha are the reputed editors of the four Maṇḍalas of the Ṛigveda. They are members of the Saptarshi group at the same time. So they possess a double importance. With regard to Kaśyapa, the old Purāṇic traditions go so far as to declare that the whole of the world originated from Kaśyapa. In fact, he is identified with Prajāpati. Gautama is a member of the Saptarshi group, while his follower or descendant Vāmadeva is the editor of the fourth Maṇḍala of the Ṛigveda. Agastya is, no doubt, beyond the pale of Saptarshis. But he appears in the Ṛigveda as an important personality on the whole. Kaṇva, Śunaka and Vadhryaśva were considered independent gaṇas in the selection of Āprī hymns. But they could not hold their ground in later times; and they were coerced down under the Bhṛigu and Aṅgiras gaṇas. Thus, it will be seen, how in forming the groups, the priestly class was careful enough to select the most hallowed names.

It will be interesting to follow the conception of Saptarshis prevalent at different times. While discussing the gotra problem, we have seen that the term is not understood by all to mean the same persons. Whether such seven individuals, forming the group, ever did exist is a question that cannot be definitely answered. But one thing is certain that even in the Ṛigveda times, the group of Seven Ṛishis had become a popular term, representing great antiquity and probably suggesting some indefinite idea or individuals. In the Ṛigveda days Trasadasyu was considered a demi-god. That Trasadasyu was the fruit of the favour of the Saptarshis. The composer of the hymn styles the Seven Ṛishis as his Pitṛis—forefathers[7]. So, the idea of the Saptarshi group is very ancient. At what time the human Saptarshis, either imaginary or real, came to be identified with the Ursa Major in the skies is uncertain. Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa states that the constellation now called the Saptarshis was once recognized as Seven Bears[8]. Thus, the seven Ṛishis were identified with the constellation Ursa Major in later times, the exact period being unknown even to the writer of the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.

The number seven has a peculiar fascination for the Aryan mind. The following Vedic verse will show how popular is the number 'seven.' "Oh, fire, seven samidhās are offered to thee; thou hast seven tongues; Ṛishis are seven; you have seven names; seven hotṛis worship you in seven ways or seven places; so, Oh, fire, fill with ghee all thy seven origins.[9]" The seven senses of the human body are considered as identical with the

7 Ṛig. IV-42.
8 Ś. Brāhmaṇa, 2-1-2-4; S. B. E. Vol. XII. p. 283.
9 T. Saṁhitā, IV-6-5-5.

Seven Ṛishis in Bṛihat Āraṇyaka Upanishad[10]. In Vedic geography we get seven rivers, while Purāṇic geographers have recorded seven islands, seven principal mountains and seven seas. The popularity of the number seven as well as the remote antiquity of the Seven Ṛishis led the Brahmins to group the gotras principally under these seven heads. Agastya, though not a member of the Saptarshi group, had a very influential school, and as he could not be brought under any one of the seven schools, his school was recognized as an independent eighth division.

Kevala Aṅgiras and Kevala Bhṛigu Groups

With regard to the remaining two gaṇas, namely, the Kevala Bhṛigu and Kevala Aṅgiras, it is to be observed that they are to be distinguished from Aṅgiras proper and proper Bhṛigu. The exact significance of the term 'Kevala' has been nowhere made clear. From the examination of the names of the pravara Ṛishis, connected with the Kevala Aṅgiras and Kevala Bhṛigu groups, we find that beyond the two names of Bhṛigu and Aṅgiras, all other pravaras such as Māndhātṛi, Ambarīsha, Yuvanāśva, Kutsa, Trasadasyu etc., are the names of famous Kshatriya kings. Gotras, belonging to Kevala Aṅgiras gaṇa, are six in number, namely, Rathītara, Mudgala, Vishṇuvṛiddha, Harita, Kaṇva and Saṅkṛiti; while the Kevala Bhṛigus are Vītahavya, Śunaka, Mitrayu and Vena. Not only the pravara Ṛishis of these gotras are illustrious Kshatriya kings, recorded in the Purāṇas, but almost in all cases, Purāṇas explicitly tell us that all these families were originally Kshatriyas, but later on they were admitted to Brahmin community. These converts have been

10 Bṛihat Āraṇyaka Upanishad, 2-2-2.

styled by the Purāṇas as 'Kshatropetāḥ Dvijātayaḥ'[11].

As is admitted on all hands, in the early Ṛigveda times the four rigid castes were not formed, although there is every possibility that there were four classes, engaged in four different pursuits. Castes, if they existed, were not probably hereditary. Thus, Kakshīvat, though of very obscure origin, could rise to the highest position in the priestly class[12]. As we have already seen, Vasishṭha and Agastya also had a questionable origin. Gradually the priest craft became hereditary in certain families. However, it was probably open for the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas to enter the order of Brahmins and vice versa. A Śūdra, named Kavasha, was admitted to Brahmanic fold[13]. While Viśvāmitra's supreme effort and his successful entry among the Brahmins is a matter that has been very exhaustively treated in the Purāṇas. Viśvāmitra was, no doubt, admitted to the Brahmin fold; but for a long time he was not completely merged among the orthodox Brahmins. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa he has been addressed by Śunaḥ-śepa, 'Oh, Rājaputra—Oh, Prince.[14]' So it appears that, though Viśvāmitra was allowed to act as a priest, it was some time after that he was recognized a full-fledged Brahmin. But Viśvāmitra's final merging among the Brahmins was so entire that afterwards a separate gaṇa or group of gotras was formed in his name. The other Kshatriya families that were somehow or other allowed to rise to Brahmanism were treated less courteously. They were not allowed to form a separate school like Viśvāmitra; but they were yoked to two very ancient schools, Bhṛigu

11 Vishṇu Purāṇa, Book IV. Chapt. XIX. (Hall's edition).
12 Max Müller, p. 29.
13 A. Brāhmaṇa, 2-19; Haug, p. 113.
14 A. Brāhmaṇa, 7-17 ; Haug, p. 469.

and Aṅgiras. But, to distinguish them from other orthodox Bhṛigus and Aṅgirasas, they were qualified with the prefix Kevala. The grouping of newly converted families under Kevala Bhṛigu and Kevala Aṅgiras gaṇas must have taken place in later times. This can be inferred from the fact that, among the divisions of gotras, made for the Āprīs, Śunaka, Vadhryaśva and Kaṇva appear as independent divisions, and are not classed under the Bhṛigu and Aṅgiras groups. Or it may be that these newly converted Kshatriya families were rather refractory to the orthodox Brahmin organization; and it was by degrees that they were brought under the fold of Bhṛigu and Aṅgiras. There is another reason why the Kshatriyas, turned into Brahmins, were classed under Bhṛigu gaṇa. Bhṛigus are well known for their chaplainship of the Kshatriya kings[15]. Whatever it might be, the word 'Kevala' prefixed to the Bhṛigus and Aṅgirasas was a significant one. It suggested that the classification was an artificial one and thus, though Vītahavya, Śunaka, Vena and Mitrayu all belong to Bhṛigu gaṇa, they can intermarry. This is clearly against the general rule of pravaras. But the fact is that, though all the four gotras are called Bhṛigus, they are really independent groups; and for the sake of formality, they are classed under the Bhṛigu gaṇa. In the same way, Rathītara, Vishṇuvṛiddha, Harita, Saṅkṛiti and Kaṇva are styled as Kevala Aṅgirasas in order to show that their belonging to the same Aṅgiras gaṇa is only a matter of form, and really means nothing. For all practical purposes the six gotras are quite independent of each other and can intermarry.

One more noteworthy feature about the Kevala Aṅgiras and Kevala Bhṛigu is that, though the really

15 Mabh. Anuśāsana Parva, 91-2.

independent ten groups were brought under Bhṛigu and Aṅgiras, some of them still remained stubborn, and would not accept the new school that was somehow forced upon them. Thus, Śunakas who were now called Kevala Bhṛigu and who for Āprī purposes formed an independent school, still refused to accept Bhṛigu as their closing pravara. Thus, some Śunakas recite only one pravara; and that is Śunaka and not Bhṛigu. The same is equally true of Vadhryaśva. Vadhryaśva was an independent gaṇa for the Āprī selection. In later days the gaṇa was known as Mitrayu gaṇa and was subordinated to the Bhṛigu. But, while some members of the Vadhryaśva gaṇa became amenable to their new teachers, others refused and maintained only one pravara Vadhryaśva. With regard to Kevala Aṅgiras gaṇa, the Mudgala group deserves our notice. Mudgala, according to Baudhāyana, though not according to Āśvalāyana, was an independent gaṇa for Āprī divisions. When afterwards brought under the Aṅgiras gaṇa, they maintained their alternative pravaras, 'Āṅgiras, Bhārmyaśva and Maudgalya' and 'Tārkshya, Bhārmyaśva and Maudgalya.' Thus, some of the Mudgalas did not identify themselves with the Aṅgiras gaṇa.

Before considering the different aspects of gotra organization, I would like to point out that under the gotra system members of a particular gotra were not necessarily expected to study a particular Veda. Dr. Fick, on the authority of a 'gotrāvali,' published at Benares, has expressed the opinion that each gotra had to study a particular Veda[16]. But, from a study of the Brahmanical gotras, spread all over India, we find that there are a lot of gotras, bearing the same name, but studying different Vedas and belonging to different Śākhās.

16 "Ency. of Religion and Ethics," Vol. 6 (1913), p. 356.

Possibility of Changing the Pravara Group i. e. the Spiritual Gotra

A careful study of the two gaṇas, Kevala Aṅgiras and Kevala Bhṛigu, will be sufficient to bring to our mind how the various groups might have been formed. Pravara grouping had nothing to do with the ancestry of a person. When pravaras had a practical meaning, they were determined according to the school of ritual or learning to which a person belonged. The ancedote of Śunaḥśepa, recorded by Brāhmaṇa works, tells us how Śunaḥśepa transferred himself from Aṅgiras to Viśvāmitra gaṇa. One more Vedic instance, where a person originally belonging to one group foresook it and adopted another group, is the legend of Gṛitsamada, as told by Sadguruśishya, in his commentary on Sarvānukramaṇī. Instead of going into the details of the story, it will be sufficient to quote the inference that Max Müller has drawn from it. "Second Maṇḍala of the Ṛigveda being originally seen by Gṛitsamada of the family of Bhṛigu, was afterwards preserved by Śaunahotra, a descendant of Bharadvāja of the race of Aṅgiras, who entered the family of Bhṛigu, took the name of Śaunaka and added one hymn the twelfth in praise of Indra."

In Matsya-Purāṇa we get the following curious information. The Kratus, Paulahas and Paulastyas belong to Agastya-gaṇa. How the three gotras were brought under Agastya-gaṇa is an interesting piece of history.[18] Kratu had no issue; so he adopted Idhmavāha, an Āgastya, for his son; and so the Kratus are Āgastyas. Pulaha had three sons. Being dissatisfied with them all, Pulaha adopted Dṛidhachyuta, an Āgastya; so Paulahas are Āgastyas. For a similar reason the Paulastyas belong

17 Max Müller, p. 118.

18 Matsya Purāṇa, (Published by Pāṇini Office) Chapter 202.

to Āgastya-gaṇa. In these three instances, not only the Āgastyas were adopted, but even their gaṇa was adopted by the adopting fathers. According to the usual practice, an adopted son has to lose the gotra of his progenitor, and he has to adopt the gotra of the adopter.[19] But in the present case the adopted son has given his gaṇa to the adopting parent. It may rest on questionable evidence whether Kratu, Pulaha and Pulastya adopted Āgastya youths for their sons. It is, however, clear that at one time Pulastya, Pulaha and Kratu families did not belong to Āgastya gaṇa, but later on they embraced the rituals and the teachings of that gaṇa.

Different Pravara Groups i. e. the Spiritual Gotras were the different Schools of Rituals

In Sūtra works we get ten principal groups of gotras. For Āprī selections also, ten divisions of gotras were made. But the two classifications do not agree. If we go back still further, we will come across only four divisions—Bhṛigu, Aṅgiras, Kaśyapa and Vasishṭha—the divisions that are found in the Mahābhārata, and over which Mr. Vaidya based many of his speculative remarks about gotras and pravaras. It has been already shown how on more than one ground the inferences of Mr. Vaidya in this connection are insupportable. The phrase 'Mūla-gotrāṇi' used in the Mahābhārata, speaks of more ancient four schools of rituals and learning. How and when the four schools developed into ten cannot be historically traced from the Vedic literature that is in existence. But from the facts that in very ancient times there existed only four groups of gotras, later on they developed into ten, those ten groups also were re-arranged and re-grouped, the reasonable conclusion would be that these gaṇas

19 Manu. IX-142.

or groups of gotras do not refer to blood relationship; but rather they disclose different schools of learning.

In Vedic times, such terms as Vasishṭhāḥ, Bhārgavāḥ and Ātreyāḥ were used not only for the members of the family of Vasishṭha, Bhṛigu and Atri, but they were often used for persons belonging to the respective schools of learning. In Taittirīya Saṁhitā and Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa, we find the sentence, "Bhārgavo hotā bhavati."[20] Here, both the senses 'family' and 'school' are equally applicable; but perhaps the latter is preferable. But the two passages that are quoted below in full will be sufficient evidence to show that these names, originally family names, were widely understood as names of different schools. "Vasishṭha knew the Virāj. Indra coveted it. He spake, 'Ṛishi, thou knowest the virāj; teach me it.' He replied, 'What would therefore accrue to me?' 'I would teach thee the expiation for the whole sacrifice. I would show thee its form.' The Ṛishi then taught Indra that virāj. And then Indra taught the Ṛishis this expiation from the Agnihotra up to the Great Litany; and formerly, indeed, the Vasishṭhas only knew these utterances; whence formerly, only one of the Vasishṭha family became a Brahman. But since now-a-days anybody may study them, anybody may now become Brahman.[21]" The second passage, if possible, is more conclusive still. "Ṛishis had not seen Indra with their physical eye. It was Vasishṭha who saw Indra eye to eye. Indra spoke to Vasishṭha, "I will teach you a Brāhmaṇa on account of which people will be born who will worship you as a Purohita. Do not, however, disclose my presence to other Ṛishis." Then Indra taught him the Stomabhagas. Then people were born with Vasishṭhas as

20 T. Saṁhitā, I-8-18 and T. Brāhmaṇa, 19-9-21.

21 Ś. Brāhmaṇa, 12-6-1-(38-39-40-41); S. B. E. Vol. XLIV. p. 212.

Purohita. So, a Vāsishṭha should be made a Brahman.[22]" The passage has been so commented on by Sāyana: 'Vasishṭha Purohitāḥ Prajāḥ,' means people who will worship Vasishṭha as their teacher, and finally, a man born of Vasishṭha's family or who is endowed with the knowledge of the Stomabhagas according to the tradition of Vasishṭha school, should be made the Brahman. The same passage occurs also in Tāṇḍya Brāhmaṇa[23]. The two passages throw much light on the real nature of such names as Vāsishṭha, Ātreya, Bhārgava etc. Originally, they may be family names; but, in after days they implied both the senses a member of the family and more often a member of the school promulgated by the ancestors of that family.

That, in reciting the pravaras the sacrificer does not really mean to recite the names of his ancestors, may be further seen from the examination of the formula of recitation. As given in Kātyāyana Śrauta Sūtra[24], the formula runs thus: "Manuvat Bharatavat Amuvat Amuvat iti yajamānārsheyāṇi āha." "He recites the Ārsheyas of the sacrificer, like Manu, like Bharata, like this, like this." Thus, Manu and Bharata are the common pravaras for all gotras. Manu and Bharata are both famous worshippers of Agni. Composers of the Ṛigveda hymns often established or enkindled or invited fire just as Manu had done[25]. The fire or Bharata is equally well known. If the sacrificer and all other gotras originated from Seven Ṛishis, the final pravara of each gotra must be a Ṛishi of the Saptarshi group. No gotra must trace back its ancestry beyond the Seven Ṛishis. But as a matter of fact, the sacrificer does go beyond the Seven

22 T, Saṁhitā, III 5-2.

23 T. Brāhmaṇa, 15-5-24.

24 Kā. Ś. Sūtra, 3-2-7.

25 Ṛig. I—31-17, V—21-1, VIII—43-27 etc.

Ṛishis, when before the recitation of his own pravaras, he recites the two names of Manu and Bharata.

It is not Kātyāyana alone who adds these two names. Even in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and even in Taittirīya Saṁhitā, the two names of Manu and Bharata are mentioned in connection with the enkindling of fire.[26] Even in the present times, when the Adhvaryu recites the names of the pravaras of the sacrificers, he always prefixes the two names of Manu and Bharata.

The Brahmins who know not their own pravaras have been enjoined to accept the pravaras of their teacher, namely, the officiating priest, on the occasion of the thread ceremony.[27] If the connection of the gotra Ṛishi with the pravara Ṛishi had been originally considered a blood connection, a Brahmin, ignorant of his own pravaras, would not have been asked to adopt the pravaras of his teacher. Though the pravaras were afterwards much misunderstood, originally they meant clear discipleship.

The Tāṇḍin's View of Pravaras

All the Sūtra-writers at the end of their pravara chapter have recorded the view of Tāṇḍins, a branch of Sāmaveda, on the pravara question. The Tāṇḍins were possibly disgusted with the dogmatic pravara recitations, and they suggested a short cut, by recommending one universal pravara 'Manu' for all castes and for all people. Baudhāyana simply states the Tāṇḍin's view, but does not opine. Āpastamba does the same thing. But on the whole, the Sūtra-writers are opposed to this view, in as much as, they place the view, at the end of the Pravarādhyāya, after the full exposition of different pravaras.

26 T. Saṁhitā, II—5-9-1; Ś. Brāhmaṇa, 1-4-2-5.

27 Pravara-Mañjarī, p. 128.

Kātyāyana—Laugākshī, however, thus try to refute the view. "Tāṇḍin's view cannot be right; because, one does not choose his Ārsheya with gods or with men. But he chooses his Ārsheya with Ṛishis. So, the pravara suggested by the Tāṇḍins may do for others excluding the Brahmins and Kshatriyas.[28]" Tāṇḍin's view may not be acceptable to the Sūtra-writers. But that they have mentioned it shows that they attached some weight to it. The Tāṇḍins suggested the one universal pravara 'Manu' for all, because the various pravaras, recited by the Brahmins, had lost all their significance and had grown mechanical, and were possibly considered bogus dogmas. Had it been otherwise, the Sūtra-writers would have made an emphatic refutation of the Tāṇḍins.

In refuting the Tāṇḍin's view Kātyāyana—Laugākshī remark, "One chooses his Ārsheya with Ṛishis alone and not with gods or men." This sentence can have intelligible sense, only when we grant that pravara selection was voluntary and deliberate, and it was not the mere recitation of names as fixed by tradition. Neither men nor gods were to be taken for standard of comparison, but only the great Ṛishis were to be so honoured. In other words, the ideal of only the great sages was to be sought for, and not the ideal of gods or men. In this Sūtra of Kātyāyana, there is not even a hint of blood connection between the sacrificer and his pravara Ṛishis. Unrestricted freedom in the selection of pravara Ṛishis is further seen from the fact that Baudhāyana mentions forty-nine pravara groups; while the author of Pravara-darpaṇa has, in all, recorded seventy-five groups.[29]

28 Pravara-Mañjarī, p. 134.

29 P. Chentsalrao, p. 285.

Gotra and Adoption

When a man has no issue, according to the practice of the Indo-Aryans, he adopts a son. The son that is recommended for adoption by the Smṛitis is a boy of tender age whose initiation ceremony is not performed. Now, the usual dictum of the Smṛitis on this point is that the son, given in adoption, should not inherit the gotra and the property of the procreating father.[30] All Sūtra and Smṛiti writers completely agree on this point. But some writers are not ready to accept the dictum as far as exogamous restrictions are concerned. For the purpose of marriage, an adopted son is considered Dvigotra—belonging to two gotras. The author of the Dattaka Mīmāṁsā, however, has taken a very critical view of the whole thing. He divides the adopted sons into three classes :—(a) a son whose tonsure and the initiation ceremonies are performed before adoption by the procreating father is a permanent Dvigotra, (b) one whose only tonsure ceremony is performed but not the initiation ceremony before the adoption is considered Dvigotra for life. His progeny will not be Dvigotra. (c) But when a child is adopted in its infancy, the question of Dvigotra does not arise altogether. From the three divisions of adopted sons, we may see the real idea underlying gotra. A son, merely by his birth, does not inherit the father's gotra. It is the Upanayana or the initiation ceremony that confers the gotra upon a boy. It is the performance of the Upanayana ceremony on account of which persons belonging to the first three castes are called Dvijas or twice-born. The Śūdras are prohibited to have the initiation ceremony performed; and thus, they are debarred from the study of the Vedas.

---

30 Manu. IX—142.

A Traivarṇika – one belonging to the first three castes—whose Upanayana ceremony is not performed before a fixed year of his age, becomes Vrātya, and nobody can study the Vedas before the initiation ceremony is duly performed. Upanayana is generally translated in English as the thread ceremony, but the translation is not quite appropriate. Wearing of the sacred thread is, no doubt, the principal feature of the ceremony now-a-days. But it is probable that at one time the principal business of the Upanayana ceremony was not to wear the sacred thread, in as much as the wearing of the sacred thread is not even mentioned in the Aśvalāyana Gṛihya Sūtra. The main significance of the ceremony of Upanayana was that thereafter the student was to go to the guru or the Vedic teacher to learn the Vedas, and to adopt the dress and the habits suitable for a student. The proper occasion to enter a particular school of learning and thus for adopting a gotra was the Upanayana ceremony. It must be admitted that the author of Dattaka Mīmāṁsā did not understand the gotra in this sense. However, in maintaining that a son merely by birth does not inherit the father's gotra, he has indirectly supported the theory that gotra and pravara systems, before they became stereotyped and almost meaningless, were not based upon blood ancestry; but more or less they referred to the discipleship of a particular school.

The following passage from Kālikāpurāṇa has been quoted by Nīlakaṇṭha in Vyavahāramayūkha. "Oh, King, a son whose ceremonies up to tonsure have been performed with the father's gotra cannot become the son of another man. If the thread and tonsure ceremonies are performed by the adopting father, the boy will be considered a son, otherwise a slave. Oh, King, sons adopted after their fifth year and others are not sons.

Having adopted a boy of five years the adopting father must perform the sacrifice for male issue." Here, the connection of gotra with the thread ceremony is clearly indicated. According to Kālikāpurāṇa, adoption has no meaning after the thread ceremony is once performed and the boy is once allowed to enter the gotra of his procreating father. Nīlakaṇṭha is opposed to this view, and on the authority of his father he maintains that a boy of any age, even the father of a son himself, is eligible for adoption. He further adds that the above passage is not found in two or three editions, and therefore should not be much attended to [31]. Whatever it might be, the fact that in certain editions of Kālikāpurāṇa the passage is found cannot be ignored; and it can be explained only on one supposition. The writer of Kālikāpurāṇa did not look upon gotra as the natural inheritance of a son. The adoption of a gotra and the adoption of the sacred thread as an emblem of the beginning of a student's life were simultaneous events. I would like here to compare the Brahmanical initiation ceremony with the form of initiation prevalent among ancient Greeks and Romans. In Greek and Roman societies, initiation of a child was performed by the father and not by the preceptor as in the Brahmin community. Besides, the initiation took place on the fifth and eighth days from the birth of the child amongst Greeks and Romans respectively. After the initiation the child was recognized as a member of its father's gens [32]. This will show how the Greek and Roman form of initiation declared and recognized the blood relationship between the father and the new-born child, while with the Indo-Aryans the initiation of the child declared the discipleship with which the child was

31 Vyavahāra Mayūkha, (Edited by P. V. Kane), p. 114.
32 Hearn, p. 73.

henceforth to be bound. In Greece and in Rome the ceremony was formal; in India it was realistic. In the former case, it was passive and peremptory; in the latter, it was active and voluntary.

Gotra in Relation to Death Impurities

If we examine the rules that govern the impurities connected with death that every Brahmin has to observe, we will find that the impurities attached to the death of a boy whose initiation ceremony is not performed are very limited in their scope. Near relatives like the sapiṇḍas have to observe impurity for three days; while the remote members of the same gotra are quite exempt from impurity. As soon as the initiation ceremony is performed, a change takes place. All sapiṇḍa relations have to observe ten days of impurity, while the distant members of the gotra have to observe three days' or one day's impurity according to their nearness to the deceased. Similarly, a male child that is not initiated and an unmarried girl are both exempt from all sorts of death impurities, the only exception being the death of either parent.[33] All Smṛiti-writers, modern and ancient, agree on this point. The special treatment, given to an unmarried girl and a boy whose initiation ceremony is not performed, can be justified only on one presumption, namely, that gotra originally at least did not pre-suppose blood relationship; but it was connected with the discipleship. Times have changed; the original meaning and the practices connected with it are long forgotten. But the dogma, that a boy until he has his initiation ceremony performed can claim no gotra, is still followed; and hidden under that dogma lies the principle of religious fraternity to which a boy could join only on the occasion of the initiation ceremony.

33 Dharma-Sindhu, p. 410.

Another important point in connection with the death impurities, observed by the Brahmins, deserves our attention. If the gotra organization had for its basis real genealogy, when a man died, his whole sept or gotra ought to have been rendered impure. But, as a matter of fact, we find that only the sapiṇḍa relations i.e. persons related within five and seven generations are affected by the death impurities [34]. The current practice of the Brahmins is to observe death impurities up to about fourteen generations; but the ancient works do not support this practice. Among ancient writers it is Āpastamba alone who records an alternative view regarding death impurities. According to Āpastamba, either the sapiṇḍa relations should observe death impurities or death impurities should be observed as long as relationship is traceable [35]. But, here also, Āpastamba does not extend the impurities to the whole sept or gotra. In the Roman society, when a man died, mourning was observed not only by the family of the deceased, but by the whole gens of the deceased [36]. In the Toda community of the Nilgiris, when a death occurs in a sept, the whole sept is rendered impure, and every member of the sept must tie his hair in a knot in front of his head for a fixed period [37]. We possess unfortunately no precise information as to whether in all primitive societies a deceased person was mourned by his family or by his sept. But from a careful study of the essential features of the gens or sept organisation all over the world, one is inclined to think that, in all probability, the death of a member in the sept affected the whole sept as far as the death impurities were concerned.

34 Gautama. XIV—1, Manu. V—59. etc.

35 Āpas. Dha. II—15-3.

36 Morgan, p. 293.

37 Rivers, "The Todas" pp. 368, 369.

Gotra and Inheritance

That the gotra and pravara had nothing to do with blood relationship may be further seen from the fact that no person is entitled to inherit the property of the deceased on the ground that he belongs to the same gotra as that of the deceased or he recites the same pravaras as were recited by the deceased. According to Manu the property of the deceased first devolves upon the nearest sapiṇḍa relation and then upon the Sakulyas. Failing the Sakulyas, the succession passes to the teacher or to the pupil.[38] Sakulya relationship extends to seven generations. Baudhāyana gives the same order of succession. First the sapiṇḍas (according to Manu and Baudhāyana, sapiṇḍa relationship continues only to the third generation, the further generations up to seven being called the Sakulyas), then the Sakulyas, and then the guru and the pupil etc.[39] Āpastamba defines the sapiṇḍa relationship as extending to seven generations and after the sapiṇḍas, he allows the property to devolve on the teacher and the pupil.[40] Vasishṭha also declares that the next immediate heir after the sapiṇḍas is the spiritual teacher.[41] Thus, the texts of Manu, Baudhāyana-Vasishṭha and Āpastamba permit the succession to remain in the relatives, only up to seven generations. After seven generations, the succession passes to the spiritual teacher, then to the pupil and finally to the learned Brahmin or to the king. If gotra and pravara showed blood relationship, after seven generations a sagotra person ought to have succeeded to the property of the deceased. In the whole Sanskrit literature, there is only one writer

---

38 Manu. IX—186, 187.
39 Bau. Dha.—I-11-9, 10, 11, 12, 13.
40 Āpas. Dha.—II-14-2, 3.
41 Vasishtha. XVII—82.

who allows the succession to pass to persons bearing the same gotra and reciting the same pravaras. According to Gautama, the successive heirs would be (1) sapiṇḍas, (2) sagotras (persons bearing the same gotra), (3) samāna-pravaras (persons reciting the same pravaras), (4) wife etc.[42] Gautama stands alone in propounding this view. Apparently the rule of Gautama is not practicable. Among the sapiṇḍa relations we can easily determine who should succeed first and who should succeed last by considering their relative proximity to the deceased; but how are we to determine the order of priority between the sagotras? There will be hundreds of sagotras; who is to be the first claimant, and who is to be the last? Or, are they all to to share equally? The same difficulty is presented by the word samāna-pravara. And what is, after all, the difference between sagotra and samāna-pravara? The identity of even one pravara constitutes the sagotra relationship. Even if one pravara is identical in the case of two persons, they belong to the same gotra. Thus, when a sagotra heir is non-existent, it means that even samāna-pravara heir is non-existent. Haradatta, the commentator, suggests that sagotra means relations bearing a common family name. This explanation of Haradatta is far from being satisfactory. Relations bearing the same family name are denoted by the word gotraja and not sagotra.[43] Gautama uses the word 'sagotra' twice in his Dharmasūtra;[44] but in both the places, the word does not mean the relations bearing the same family name. My own explanation of the Sūtra in question is that Gautama inserted the words 'sagotra' and 'samāna-pravara' in one of his idealistic moods. He probably meant nothing definite by these words. Had he

42 Gautama. XXVIII—21.

43 Yājñavalkya Smṛiti, II—135.

44 Gautama. XVIII—6, XXIII —12.

been really serious about the devolution of succession on the sagotras and samāna-pravaras, he would have certainly, on the same analogy, extended the death impurities to the sagotras and the samāna-pravaras. But he does not prescribe any impurity for the sagotras in connection with death. Gautama, therefore, in all probability, added the two words, 'sagotra and samāna-pravara' in the line of heirs without any definite purpose. No writer after Gautama accepted the order of succession as laid down by Gautama. We may presume, therefore, that subsequent law-givers as well as the laity did not attach any importance to the rule of Gautama. It seems that the rule remained a dead letter. It may be further observed that many later writers followed Gautama in prescribing a severe penance for sagotra marriage; but on the question of inheritance, he did not get a single follower. It will be reasonable, therefore, to conclude that Brahmin law-givers did not allow the succession to pass to the sagotras and samāna-pravaras, thereby showing that sagotra persons may be brothers in a spiritual and dogmatic sense, but for all practical purposes they are nothing less than strangers.

As far as the law of inheritance is concerned, the gotra institution of the Brahmins may, with every propriety, be contrasted with the gens of the primitive races as well as the Grecian and Roman gens, in which the property was never allowed to drift outside the gens, and in the absence of a direct heir, property of the deceased was distributed among his gentiles. As has been exhaustively pointed out by Morgan in his "Ancient Society," the idea of individual ownership is always subordinated to communal ownership in every sept or gens organisation. In India, as all the non-Aryan aboriginal tribes are being continuously. Brahmanised for the last four

thousand years, it is no longer possible in India to find non-Aryan tribes which are still leading a really primitive life. In most cases, the non-Aryan tribes in India are so completely transformed that whenever we want to contrast the Aryans with the non-Aryan tribes, we have often to look outside India. Few hill-tribes in India have, however, still retained most of their important primitive practices still intact; and we find that among the Todas, lands are always regarded as the property of the whole sept.[45] The Muṇḍas inhabiting the highlands of Chotanagpore, till very recently, recognised the principle of communal ownership of property; and even now there are no less than 156 Muṇḍa villages in Ranchi district where each village constitutes the joint property of the whole kili or sept.[46] In deciding whether a particular sept organisation is genuine, the law of inheritance serves as a crucial test. Brahmin law-givers, conscious of the artificialness of their gotra organisation, based their law of inheritance on family and not on gotra.

The Brahmanical gotra lacks the very essentials of a genuine gens organization

Morgan had made a very critical study of the gens organization, found in different parts of the world. The mature fruit of his labours and investigations we find in his "Ancient Society." According to Morgan, the gens is individualized by certain rights, privileges and obligations, conferred and imposed upon its members.[47] Thus, (1) Every gens has a recognized elected head. (2) The gens can depose its head. (3) All members of the gens possess mutual rights of inheritance of the property of the deceased members. (4) All members of the gens

45 Rivers, "The Todas," p. 557.

46 Roy, "The Mundas," appendix III. p. XLVII.

47 Morgan, pp. 71, 222, 223, 285.

are bound by reciprocal obligations of help, defence and redress of injuries. (5) The gens as a whole has the right of adopting strangers into the gens. (6) Each gens has a common burial ground. (7) Each gens possesses a council of gentiles. With slight variations these characteristics are found in the gens of various peoples either primitive or civilized. As regards the southern Slavs, Greeks and Romans, there is clear evidence that the gens of these peoples possessed the above characteristics almost in their entirety.[48] Regarding the gens of the primitive peoples, spread all over the world, it is not quite possible to make a uniform statement, especially on the subject of the mutual inheritance of the gentiles. Our knowledge of the primitive tribes as a whole is as yet scanty and uncertain. Besides, there are several primitive tribes who are still nomadic in their habits and who possess no permanent property worth the name. In such cases it is next to impossible to find out the exact rule of inheritance. It is possible that different laws of inheritance may be applicable for different kinds of properties, but the very constitution of the gens presupposes that all members of the gens regard themselves as having a share by right in the territory held by the collective body of the gens.[49] Morgan is of opinion that one more essential feature of the gens organization is the prohibition to marry within the gens. I have shown in the opening chapter that Morgan's conclusion is only partially true. With the different branches of the Aryan Race, gens was an endogamous unit and not an exogamous one. Due to the continuous Brahmanization of

48 Schrader, "Prehistoric Antiquities of the Aryan Peoples," translated by Jevons, (1890), p. 397; Maine, "Ancient Law," (1880), p. 264.

49 Vinogradoff, "Outlines of Historical Jurisprudence," Vol. I. p. 307.

non-Aryan tribes in India, it is not possible now to say precisely whether the ancient gens of the non-Aryans in India satisfied the tests of genuine gens organization laid down by Morgan. However, certain hill-tribes in India like the Todas, Orāons, Muṇḍas etc. that are comparatively less transformed, even now satisfy some of the tests enumerated above. Every sept of these tribes has its own cremation ground.[49A] Every sept has its own recognized head.[50] There is a council of gentiles for each sept.[51] Landed property is regarded as a joint property of the whole sept.[52]

As regards the Brahmanical gotra, I have already pointed out that the Brahmanical law of inheritance is different from the law of inheritance prevailing in the gens organization. In determining succession Brahmanical gotra organization is completely inoperative. The idea of communal property is totally absent in the Brahmin civilization.

Now, I will take up the various tests of a genuine gens organization one by one. In a gens organization there is a recognized elected head for each gens or sept who can be deposed by the gens. Brahmanical gotra does not seem to have any such recognized head. In the Ṛigveda, we come across two words expressing the idea of chiefdom, Kulapa and Vrajapati.[53] We are told in the hymn that Kulapa (the head of the family) is a subordinate of the Vrajapati (the head of the village).

49A Rivers, "The Todas," p. 338; Roy, "The Mundas," p. 387, 388.

50 Rivers, "The Todas," p. 556; Roy, "The Mundas," p. 418.

51 Rivers, "The Todas" p. 550; Roy, "The Mundas," p. 419.

52 Rivers, "The Todas" p. 557; Roy, "The Mundas," appendix III. p. XLVII; Roy, "The Orāons," pp. 372–374.

53 Ṛig. X—179-2.

Thus, it will be seen that kula (a family) and vraja (a village) may have their recognized heads; but neither the Kulapa nor the Vrajapati had anything to do with the Brahmanical gotra.

In a gens organization all members of the gens are bound to help each other, to defend each other and to answer for each other. This principle of mutual responsibility is quite foreign to the Indo-Aryan culture. In the gens organization individual is always submerged in the corporation. Among the Indo-Aryans, even the parallel cousins on the paternal side were not bound to help each other. On the contrary, as I have already pointed out, a parallel cousin on the paternal side is called a Bhrātṛivya—an enemy—in Vedic literature.

Every genuine gens possesses a separate burial ground. In the Brahmin community, not only each gotra did not possess a separate burning ground, but, in all probability, members of all gotras and of all castes were cremated in the same cemetery.

Each gens has a council of gentiles. In the Brahmin society also we find a council called Parishad. But the Parishad is not meant for any particular gotra. It is a judicial institution meant for the whole Brahmin or even the whole Indo-Aryan community. Nobody was entitled to be a member of the Parishad on the ground that he belonged to a particular gotra. In fact, the Parishad was a body of people well-versed in different sciences. The Parishad sometimes consisted of ten members and at times even of one member.[54] Thus, it will be seen that the Brahmanical Parishad very materially differs from the council of gentiles.

Every gens possesses a right to admit strangers into it. In the Brahmin community also adoption was in

54 Gautama. XXVIII—48-50; Manu. XII—110-113.

vogue. But in the gens organization, the adoption was a gentile business, and the adopting father could not adopt a son in his family unless he first secured the permission of his gentiles. In the Brahmin society a father could adopt a son irrespective of the wishes of the members of his gotra. As a matter of fact, on the occasion of the ceremony of adoption the members of his gotra were not required even to be invited. Whenever a son was to be adopted the adopting father had to invite his bandhus i.e. his relatives and the king also was to be informed; but the adoption had nothing to do with his gentiles, the members of his gotra.[55] In the same way, whenever an outcast was to be received back in the society, the relatives and not the gentiles of the outcast performed the ceremony of purification.[56]

I have now considered almost all the important tests of a genuine gens given by Morgan. It is clear that the Brahmanical gotra organization does not satisfy any of these tests. I would like to make it quite clear here that by the expression 'genuine gens organization' I do not mean that every gens organization is necessarily based on genealogy, though there is every probability that the members of a gens are descended from a common ancestor. In a genuine gens organization there is a firm belief among the gentiles that they are descended from a common ancestor and all their social laws are based upon this belief. What I have been trying to show up to this time is that gotra institution was not based upon ancestry, and at least in its early stages the Brahmin law-givers were fully conscious of the artificialness of the organization and all their social legislations, excepting the marriage

---

55 Vasishtha. XV—6; Bau Dha. Pariśishṭa, VII—5-8; S. B. E. Vol. XIV. p. 335.

56 Bau. Dha. II—1-36.

legislation, were based upon the unit of the family and not of the gotra.

An Explanation for the Confusion of Discipleship into Blood Relationship

The question must be now answered how a system, once resting on discipleship, was misconceived as representing blood relationship. It has been already shown how the passage from Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa,[57] where the words father, son etc. are used only by way of illustration, was misconstrued by later writers. It may be said that this Śatapatha passage is mainly responsible for giving a tinge of blood relationship, to the choosing of pravaras. In Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa[58] and in Bṛihat-Āraṇyaka Upanishad[59] we are supplied with long lists of names, but the lists do not represent the genealogy of a family; but therein we get the record of the line of teachers. The original Sanskrit word used for 'line of teachers' is 'Vaṁśaḥ'. Popular sense of the word 'Vaṁśaḥ' is genealogy. But in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, as well as in the Bṛi. Ā. Upanishad, the word Vaṁśaḥ means a line of teachers. This will explain how the word 'Father,' 'Son,' etc. used by the Brāhmaṇa, are not to be interpreted literally. In ancient India a teacher was held in great reverence. The student is asked to revere his teacher more than his father. The word Guru means both the father and the teacher. In fact, on the occasion of the thread ceremony, when a person is believed to be born again, the teacher is the father. The second birth which is the spiritual birth is considered to be of the highest importance, and compared

---

57 Ś. Brāhmaṇa, 1-5-1-10; S. B. E. Vol. XII. pp. 133, 134.

58 Ś. Brāhmaṇa, end of 10th and 14th Kāṇḍas.

59 End of the Bṛi. Ā. Upanishad.

to it, the physical birth and the natural parents are insignificant.[60] "The Brahmin has two-fold seed; one resting in the part of the body above the navel, and the other in the part of the body below the navel. The seed that resides above the navel procreates the offsprings—those whose thread ceremony he performs, whom he teaches, and whom he acts as a priest and whom he obliges. From the seed below the navel are the children procreated in the usual way. So they never call a learned Śrotriya childless."[61] The second birth is declared to be the best by Āpastamba also.[62] This shows the Hindu mentality on this point; and if we bear it in mind properly, we shall not be surprised at all at the terms used by Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa and Taittirīya Saṁhitā in connection with the Ārsheya.

So far, the gotras and pravaras, as found among the Brahmins, have been completely examined; and in these pages, I have tried to establish that gotras originally did not signify anything more than family names or surnames, that pravaras were various schools of learning and rituals, that pravaras had no reference to descent, that pravaras had a real meaning when Vedic rituals were living institutions, that gotras or family names were arranged on the basis of the pravaras, and finally, this gaṇa or group organization of gotras was in its early days a changeable factor, and the organization is not as ancient as it is popularly believed to be. The Brāhmaṇa period and the Sūtra period are the two ends between which the organization was completed.

60 Manu. II—145-150.
61 Vasishṭha. II—5.
62 Āpas. Dha. I—1-16.

CHAPTER V

The Gotras and Pravaras of the Kshatriyas and Vais'yas

Before proceeding, it is necessary to discuss the gotras and pravaras of Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas. Mr. Vaidya is very emphatic in asserting that both Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas have gotras and pravaras of their own. All his arguments are, however, vitiated by his fundamental misconception of gotra and pravara system. Mr. Vaidya thinks that gotras and pravaras are indicative of descent, and several Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas composed Vedic hymns, and as the names of hymn-composers are the names recited by way of pravaras, it naturally follows that Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas must have gotras and pravaras just like Brahmins.[1] Every part of this argument has been met and refuted in the previous chapters. It has been already shown that gotras and pravaras do not indicate blood-ancestry, that the Sarvānukramaṇī is not an authentic record of the names of the hymn-composers, and granting that it is so, the pravara Ṛishis are not necessarily the hymn-composers. One more question may be directed against Mr. Vaidya. How does he determine that a particular hymn-composer is a Kshatriya and a particular composer a Vaiśya? The Purāṇas are the sole authority of Mr. Vaidya on this point. Thus, we are told in the Vishṇupurāṇa that all Vaiśyas are to be traced back to Bhalandana. The date of Vishṇupurāṇa has been ascertained to be the seventh or eighth century after Christ. The Sūtra works wherein the name of Bhalandana occurs as the one of the three pravara Ṛishis for the Vaiśyas were composed at about 500 B.C. Allowing Vishṇupurāṇa its due value, one cannot help thinking that the Purāṇa declared Bha-

1 History of Mediæval Hindu India, Vol. II. pp. 58—68.

landana to be a Vaiśya, because the Sūtra-writers had assigned that pravara to the Vaiśyas. The same objection may be raised against Mr. Vaidya's Kshatriya composers of Vedic hymns.

In his article on 'gotra', in the Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, Dr. R. Fick on the strength of Buddhistic and Jain evidence has expressed views, very similar to those of Mr. Vaidya. He holds that the gotra and pravara had their recognised place in both the Kshatriya and Vaiśya communities. In Buddhistic and Jain works, names of Kshatriyas are often mentioned together with their gotras. Regarding the borrowing of the Brahmanical gotras by the Kshatriyas, Dr. Fick writes, "If sometimes the arrogance of the priest led them to regard their own ancestors as more worthy to be named than the king's, yet the inference that some have drawn from this, viz. that the gotra of the Purohita was transferred to the king, whom he serves, must be rejected without qualification.[2]" Evidently, Dr. Fick is working under more than one misconception. As has been exhaustively shown in the last chapter, pravara-recitation was in no way connected with blood-ancestry. What Dr. Fick calls an inference is not an inference at all; but it is a clear statement of facts. As will be shown in the sequel, all Sūtra-writers lay down that the king should borrow the pravaras of his Purohita, or in the alternative, they suggest one stock pravara for all Kshatriyas. Compilers of Brāhmaṇa works also speak in the same tune. In the face of these statements, one is not justified in regarding that the transference of the Purohitas' gotras to the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas was only a myth. With whatever justification for the practice, one must admit that, as far as the Brahmanical works tell us, trans-

2 Ency. of Religion and Ethics, Vol. VI. p. 356.

ference of the Purohitas' gotras to the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas was an actual fact.

It is true that in Buddhistic and Jain works several Kshatriyas are mentioned with their gotras. Thus, Mahāvīra was a Kāśyapa and Buddha was a Gautama. But both Buddhism and Jainism were revolts of the Kshatriyas against the orthodox Brahmin supremacy. If the Buddhistic and Jain heresies were to find favour with the masses, it was quite necessary for the promulgators and the propagandists of the new sects to show to the world that they were in no way inferior to the ancient Brahmin teachers who were of course endowed with the sacred Bahmanical gotras. We all know that quack doctors are always in need of bogus degrees. Since the days of the Brāhmaṇa works the Brahmins were making the most of their exclusive gotra organization. So, the Buddhistic and Jain teachers had perforce to put on the same Brahmanical feathers, at least in the early days of their heresies. That the Buddhists were in no sense serious about their gotras may be inferred from the fact that in the marriage laws of the Buddhists, gotra plays absolutely no part.

As noted by Dr. Fick, in the Kumbhakāra-Jātaka Bhāggava gotra—Bhargava gotra—is assigned to the potter. Fick thinks that too much importance should not be attached to this gotra of the potters. Going still further, I should like to say that too much importance should not be attached to the gotras of the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas mentioned in the Buddhistic and Jain works. Even in these works gotras are generally assigned to the Kshatriyas, but not to the Vaiśyas. The basis of the Brahmanical gotra is pravara. One significant fact regarding the gotras of the Buddhistic and Jain teachers is that nowhere in their works we find

any discussion or even mention of their pravaras. Gotra, void of its pravara basis, was only a semblance and not a reality. We may, therefore, reasonably, argue that the assumption of gotras by the Kshatriyas was a vain imitation of the Brahmins.

If, as Dr. Fick believes, the Kshatriyas had their own gotras and pravaras, and it was only the Brahmin arrogance that refused to recognize their claim, when the Kshatriyas rose in rebellion against the Brahmins, they would have certainly prepared exhaustive lists of their gotras and pravaras, in opposition to the Brahmanical Mahāpravarādhyāyas of the Śrauta Sūtras. In Buddhistic and Jain literature which is sufficiently copious we do not find any list, enumerating the gotras and pravaras of the Kshatriyas.

Instead of further refuting Dr. Fick's views on this point, it would be better to treat the question from a broader point of view. In the Ṛigveda times, the four classes of people, namely, the priestly class, the warrior class, the agricultural class and the class of the menials or slaves were probably formed. But people of the first three classes could interchange their professions and could intermarry. As the dividing line between the classes was not clearly marked, keen sense of class superiority and inferiority, in all probability, did not exist. But coming down to the later times we find that the atmosphere is changed. More or less it is surcharged with the pedantry and ego of the priestly class. The Brahmin caste has become hereditary. There is a clear cut line drawn between the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas on one side and the Brahmins on the other. Kshatriya being a powerful and influential man, some consideration is shown to him, but the Vaiśya is treated with very scant courtesy. All through the closing chapters of the Aita-

reya Brāhmaṇa, there has been a systematic effort to point out the difference between the Brahmin and the Kshatriya, and the superiority of the former over the latter. Myths have been invented, and fables have been framed to impress this one fact that Brahmin is every way superior to other castes. Thus, it has been told that the deity of the sacrifice fled away from the Kshatra, but it accepted the Brahmin. The Brahmin alone can drink soma juice. While the Kshatriyas must satisfy themselves with Audumber juice. The remaining food in a sacrifice can be eaten only by the Brahmin, and not by the Kshatriya. Every king must have a Brahmin chaplain with him. If he fails to secure the services of one, very disastrous results would follow. All this sort of argument points only to one aim—the aim of establishing the Brahmin supremacy over the minds of the Kshatriyas. With regard to the pravaras of the Kshatriyas, the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa has made no half-hearted statement. When the Kshatriya is performing a sacrifice, "the ancestral (?) fire of the Kshatriya's house-priest is to be mentioned. This is certainly so. Having laid aside his implements and having taken those of a Brahma, and having thus become Brahma, he returned to the sacrifice. Therefore they should proclaim him as a Dīkshita with the names of his house-priest's ancestral fire, and invoke them also in pravara prayer." [3] Thus, the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa flatly refuses the pravaras to the Kshatriyas. The reason is obvious. The clear purpose of the priests was to reduce the Kshatriya to a subordinate position. The Brahmin must be made indispensable. The Kshatriya must be made to realise his position in religious and sometimes even in political matters as always dependent upon the Brahmins. If

3 A. Brāhmaṇa, 7-25; Haug, 478, 479.

the Brahmin and the Kshatriya both could claim Ārsheya, a Kshatriya may demand equality with the priest. It was necessary, therefore, to convince the Kshatriya that he, having no pravaras of his own, must borrow the pravaras of the house-priest. The choice of the Ārsheya had originally been the simple practice of choosing the names of the ancients, by way of standard of comparison, whenever the fire was established, enkindled, or invoked. But now to exhibit their superiority over the Kshatriyas, the Brahmins claimed that they were connected in blood relationship with the names mentioned in the Ārsheyas. Kshatriyas having no descent from a Ṛishi can have no Ārsheya ; and what was more, the Kaushītakī Brāhmaṇa tells us, "gods do not accept the oblations of those who have not descent from a Ṛishi."[4] Thus, it was a double game. The Kshatriyas were told, on one hand, that they had no Ārsheya; on the other hand, they were warned that the oblations of people not endowed with Ārsheya will not be acceptable to gods. In other words, if the Kshatriyas want to offer a sacrifice, they must depend every way on the priest.

The dictum of the Brāhmaṇa works that a Kshatriya should adopt the pravaras of the Brahmin priest does not seem to have been quite readily accepted by the Kshatriyas; because, later on, authors of the Sūtra works, while maintaining that a Kshatriya and a Vaiśya should adopt the pravaras of the Brahmin house-priest, have made a provision for those who might prove most refractory. 'Manu, Ila, Purūravas' are the three names of pravaras for the Kshatriyas, and for the Vaiśyas, 'Maṅkila, Vatsaprī and Bhalandana' are mentioned.[5] Āpastamba assigns only one name to the Vaiśyas

4 Kaushītakī Brāhmaṇa, 3–2.
5 Pravara-Mañjarī, pp. 126–127.

namely Vatsaprī.[6] In connection with the pravaras of the Kshatriyas, Āpastamba makes in all three statements which contradict each other. (1) Kshatriyas have only one uniform pravara, formed by 'Purūravas, Ila and Manu.' (2) Kshatriyas should select the pravara of their priest. (3) And finally those Kshatriyas who have Mantrakṛits i.e. the composers of the Ṛigveda hymns in their family should recite their own pravaras.[7] The fact is that Āpastamba himself had no clear notion as to the real nature of pravaras. The dictum of the Brāhmaṇa works that Kshatriyas have no pravaras of their own was before him. Possibly some Kshatriyas were dissatisfied with the dictum. To reconcile all factions, Āpastamba wrote the three rather inconsistent Sūtras. If the Kshatriyas were really entitled to recite pravaras like the Brahmins, why does Āpastamba mention only one pravara consisting of three names for Kshatriyas, and consisting of only one name for the Vaiśyas? Himself not knowing the real significance of the pravaras, Āpastamba laid down that those Kshatriyas who have Mantrakṛits in their family should choose their own pravaras. If the Kshatriyas—some at least—had the privilege of selecting their own pravaras, where was the necessity of asserting that Kshatriyas have only one pravara, namely, 'Purūravas, Ila, Manu'?

Here, I would like to make it clear again that the point in dispute is the pravaras, and not the gotras. The number of gotras amounted to millions and millions, on the authority of Baudhāyana himself.[8] It has been already pointed out that gotra signified nothing beyond a surname of the modern society, and Kshatriyas

---

6 P. Chentsalrao, p. 318.

7 P. Chentsalrao, p. 317.

8 Pravara-Mañjarī, p. 7.

and Vaiśyas had certainly surnames. Every civilized society has to adopt surnames. That Brahmins had gotras i.e. surnames, and the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas were without them is absurd; and as a matter of fact that was not the case. In all probability the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas never had any pravaras. What happened was that the priestly class embracing the whole Brahmin community was slowly organizing itself. A classification of the Brahmins was made on the basis of pravaras; and in this way, certain number of spiritual groups were formed called the gaṇas or groups of gotras. This was not certainly one man's work or even one generation's work. The groups or gaṇas must have been in formation for a considerable time. Groups were arranged and re-arranged, before they were made or rather before they turned out stereotyped. When caste feeling between the Brahmins and the Kṣhatriyas grew keener and keener, this internal organization must have taken place. It being a spiritual organization of the Brahmin community, it is natural that the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas were not accommodated in that organization. Mr. Vaidya is at pains to establish that Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas are the descendants of the Ṛishis, and the composers of the Vedic hymns. But the question whether the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas are the descendants of the great Ṛishis really does not arise. The problem of pravara is not allied with descent. It has a spiritual significance. It is based upon different schools of rituals and learning. Brahmins, being undoubtedly the chief exponents of rituals and learning, very naturally kept the other castes outside the pale of pravaras. The Brahmin was very anxious to establish his supremacy over others in all the spheres, and especially in the religious and spiritual spheres. The pravara organization became a very effective weapon in his hand, and the Brahmin

used it to his full advantage, as we read in the Kaushītakī Brāhmaṇa, that Kshatriyas, having no descent from the Ṛishis, have no pravaras; and the oblations of one who is not a member of the pravara organisation are not directly acceptable to the gods. Thus, the spiritual gotra, based upon pravara, was denied to the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas. Mr. Vaidya has put forth the evidence of several copper-plates to prove that Kshatriyas did possess spiritual gotras; but his contention may be very easily answered. Wherever a gotra is attributed to a Kshatriya king, no mention is made whether it is the house-priest's gotra or the king's own gotra. On the contrary, it may be proved that the gotra attributed to a Kshatriya is the gotra of his house-priest. A Tailaṅgaṇa poet, Neloor Vīrarāghava, wrote a poetic work, named Kāma-Kalānidhi, under orders from Jayasinha Bhonsle, grandson of Ekoji[9]. In that work it has been clearly stated that Bhonsle's original ancestor was one Bhonsal. His house-priest was a Gādhi-suta. So Bhonsles belong to Kauśika gotra.

---

9 Vividha-Jñāna-Vistāra, May 1923, p. 221.

CHAPTER VI

Sept Exogamy in Sūtra Times

The problem of gotra and pravara has been so far treated from different points of view. It now remains to explain how gotras and pravaras came to be connected with exogamy. Exogamy, as at present current in India, has got two aspects. One feature of exogamy forbids marriage between members belonging to the same sept, gotra or gota; while the other aspect of exogamy bars the mating of persons connected to each other within certain generations. First sort of exogamy may be called gotra or sept exogamy; while the latter may be styled sapiṇḍa exogamy or exogamy based upon genealogy. The Sūtra and Smṛiti writers have described the two aspects of exogamy together; but in continuation of the discussion in previous chapters, it will be convenient to take sept or gotra exogamy first.

It has been already observed in the opening chapter that the Indo-Iranians, including the Iranians and the Indo-Aryans, must have probably been a non-exogamous group of people; and it naturally follows that the Indo-Aryans also were probably non-exogamous, for some time at least, after their settlement in the Punjab. We may be justified in saying that in the early Vedic period the Indo-Aryans did not practice sept-exogamy; because the sept exogamy of the Indo-Aryans is based upon gotras and pravaras; and in the Ṛigveda times the word gotra did not convey one definite sense, and it certainly did not denote a family or family name. However, the fact cannot be ignored that, though gotra exogamy was not yet established, inbreeding had ceased to be practised. Marriage was contracted outside the family, though nothing can be definitely said as to the

exact number of generations that were thus excluded. In other words, we may say that, in early Vedic times though the gotra or sept exogamy was absent, sapiṇḍa exogamy of some sort that excluded certain generations in marriage especially on the agnatic side, was in practice. Leaving the early Vedic times, as we turn to the days of Saṁhitās other than the Ṛigveda and the Brāhmaṇa works, we find that the gotras have been established, and the recitation of the names of the pravara Ṛishis has begun. Sept exogamy is not mentioned or even suggested in Brāhmaṇa works; but as we find it well-established in the Sūtras, the reasonable inference would be that in later Vedic times the rule of sept exogamy must have been in the process of formation. It may not have been universally accepted in Brāhmaṇa times; but the rule was there, though it may have been very loosely observed. Unless we take matters in this light, we shall not be able to explain how all of a sudden the rule appears in the Sūtra works in such an established form.

Sept exogamy is mentioned for the first time in the Sūtra works. Thus, at the end of the Mahāpravarādhyāya of Baudhāyana, we get, "One must practise the Chāndrāyaṇa i.e. the Lunar penance, if he marries a girl, belonging to his own gotra. The Brahmin wife should not be abandoned, but should be attended to like the mother or sister. The issue from such a union is not polluted. He is called a Kaśyapa" [1]. The Chāndrāyaṇa or the Lunar penance is a penance lasting over a month. According to the Sūtra-writers, main business in the Lunar penance is to observe full or partial fasts during the whole month. The penance begins on the full moon day on which the penitent takes fifteen mouthfuls of

1 Pravara—Mañjarī, p. 136.

food. On every successive day the quantity is to be diminished by one mouthful till the new moon day on which a full fast has to be observed. During the next fortnight, on the first day one mouthful of food is to be taken and the quantity of the food is to be increased by one mouthful every day till the full moon day. In his Dharma-Sūtra, Baudhāyana expresses a somewhat different view. For a sagotra marriage the only penance that he prescribes is abandoning the wife as far as the sexual life is concerned and protecting her as one's mother. If the marriage proves fruitful, Kṛichchhra penance for three months is to be performed, and two oblations are to be offered to fire with two particular Mantras.[2] The performance of a Kṛichchhra penance generally covers a period of twelve days. A man has to abstain from food in the evening for the first three days; for the next three days he must not take his morning meal. During the remaining period for the first three days, he is to content himself with the food that he may get without his seeking for it, and for the last three days he has not to taste any food at all. Baudhāyana is considered an ancient Sūtra-writer. He may be the first Sūtra-writer or may not be; but, it is certain that Baudhāyana lived some five or six centuries before the Christian era, and that he is senior to Āpastamba. [3] The first passage occurs in the Pravarādhyāya, and in consideration of the context, the word 'gotra', as used here, does not mean a family, but it carries the new technical sense which, as we have seen, Baudhāyana forced on it. Gotra here stands for an exogamous group, formed on the basis of pravaras that each Brahmin recited. Two other ancient Dharma-Sūtras, the Gautama and Vasishtha,

---

2 Bau. Dha. I—1—38.

3 S. B. E. Vol. II. Introduction to Āpastamba, pp. 20, 43.

lay down the rule of exogamy on the same lines. In the three Sūtras, therefore, the rule of sept exogamy, based upon pravaras, seems to have been well established.

Sept Exogamy must have begun with Gotra, pure and simple, meaning a family name

Such an established rule of exogamy as is enunciated by the three writers cannot be formulated and made acceptable to the society in one day. Such social laws pre-suppose the gradual working of the legislators' mind for several generations. When India lacked one central political authority, such social laws could develop only gradually. Besides, gotra, meaning a family or family name, was a prior institution; while pravaras were connected with gotras afterwards. Sept exogamy in its infancy must have been confined to simple gotra; and later on the restrictions were made more wide by referring them to pravaras. From the famous enunciation of the rule of exogamy by Baudhāyana it is clearly observed that exogamy began with pure and simple gotra i.e. family or family name. He lays down that the gotras, included in the Kevala-Bhṛigu and Kevala-Aṅgiras groups, who in all amount to ten, should be treated as separate gotras for the purposes of marriage, although they may have one or more identical pravara Ṛishis. Baudhāyana observes that, otherwise, the number of the samāna-gotras (people having the same gotra) would be too large.[4] Generally, the similarity of even one pravara Ṛishi constitutes the sameness of the gotra; while, in the case of the Kevala-Bhṛigu and Kevala-Aṅgiras groups, a great latitude is allowed, lest the rigid application of the rule would reduce the number of the marriageable families to very narrow limits.

4 Pravara—Mañjarī, p. 12.

Thus, it will be seen that the law of sept exogamy must have originated with the gotra, pure and simple; i.e. the gotra meaning a family name or surname; and it was only later on that it was grafted on the pravaras. For the early and elastic stages of exogamy, if possible, we must go back to the literature prior to the Sūtra works. Saṁhitās other than the Ṛigveda Saṁhitā and Brāhmaṇa works are considered the immediate predecessors of the Sūtras. But in that part of Vedic literature, we get no trace of sept exogamy, even in those places where we may reasonably expect it.

Manu is the first and foremost Legislator of the Indo-Aryans

Eventually, our attention is directed to Mānava-Dharma-Śāstra. The recension of Manu that has come down to us is rather a recent work. It was composed, according to Bühler, at the beginning of the Christian era, between 200 B.C. and 200 A.D. The Dharma-Sūtras of Gautama, Baudhāyana and Vasishṭha are dated two to three centuries earlier than Manu's work that is available to us. However, it is a well-known fact that Manu's work is held in the greatest reverence by the people of India. Almost all Smṛiti-writers consider Manu as the highest authority. In Taittirīya Saṁhitā, we get, "Whatever Manu spoke is wholesome like medicine." Manu is quoted as a great authority both by Gautama[5] and Baudhāyana.[6] Bṛihaspati declares that the first rank amongst legislators belongs to Manu, because he embodies the essence of the Veda in his work. That Smṛiti which is opposed to the tenor of the laws of Manu is not approved.[7] In the Mahābhārata, the question of marriage has been

5 Gautama. XXI—7.

6 Bau. Dha. II—3-2, IV—1-13, IV—2-15, etc.

7 Bṛihaspati. XXVII—3. S. B. E. Vol. XXXIII. . 387.

fully treated in a separate chapter, and we find that the rule of exogamy has been stated there in the name of Manu.[8] Parāśara also regards Manu as the most ancient law-giver. "In the Kṛita Yuga prevailed the duties as dictated by Manu; in the Tretā age Gautama was supreme; in the Dvāpāra, Śaṅkha and Likhita were the authorities, while in the Kali age laws given by Parāśara hold good[9]."

Manu, therefore, must be allowed to be the first law-giver in India. The present version of Manu-Smṛiti, according to Nārada-Dharma-Śāstra, is the fourth version of Manu. In his introduction to Nārada-Smṛiti, Jolly has supported the theory that Mānava-Dharma-Śāstra must have been a very ancient work, abridged and slightly changed from time to time; and the latest version is the Bhṛigu's version. On this supposition only, the various discrepancies in the Manu-Smṛiti can be satisfactorily explained. Vasishṭha has often quoted Manu, and from these quotations, it seems that the older work of Manu was partly in verse and partly in prose Sūtra style. Some of the portions quoted by Vasishṭha from the older work of Manu are found in the present metrical composition of Bhṛigu, and some are lost sight of. "In ancient times, Manu's name had as great a charm for the Brahmin teachers as it has for those of the present day, and that the old Mānava-Dharma-Sūtra was one of the leading works on the subject, or, perhaps, even held that dominant position which the metrical Manu-Smṛiti actually occupied in the middle ages and theoretically occupies in our days."[10]

It must be further observed that Bhṛigu, in revising and recasting the older work of Manu, has doubtless

8 Anuśāsana Parva, 79-20.

9 Parāśara. I—24.

10 Bühler, in S. B. E. Vol. XIV. Introduction, p. XX.

retained much of the older portion intact or slightly changed. On the topic of marriage, while laying down the rule of exogamy, he seems to stick to the older version of the work. Compared with the contemporary works on law, the law of sept exogamy, as given in the metrical Manu-Smṛiti, is very brief in its statement and loose in its application. The only possible explanation for its looseness and briefness that we can offer is that Bhṛigu, in laying down the rules regulating marriage, has kept up the tradition of the older Mānava-Dharma-Sūtra which was composed, in all probability, when strong public opinion in favour of sept exogamy had not been formed.

Manu's Rule of Sept Exogamy

Manu so defines a marriageable bride: "She must not be a sapiṇḍa of the mother and the father, and (at the same time) she must not belong to the gotra of the father. Such a girl is recommended in marriage for the twice-born for the performance of religious rites and conjugal union."[11] Here, the pravara is not mentioned. Gautama lays down that marriage is allowed with a girl not reciting the same pravara.[12] According to Vasishṭha, a householder should secure for a wife a girl that does not belong to the same gotra and does not recite the same pravara.[13] In this connection, Baudhāyana and Āpastamba use the word 'sagotra'[14], but taking into consideration the context, in which they use it, the word gotra must be understood in its comprehensive sense. It means an exogamous group, arranged on the basis of the common pravaras, and beyond which the marriage

11 Manu. III—5.
12 Gautama. IV—2.
13 Vasishṭha. VIII—1.
14 Pravara-Mañjari, p. 136; Āpas. Dha. II—11-15.

must be contracted. All the four writers lay stress on the similarity of pravaras; so their rule of exogamy is fully comprehensive. Manu, however, altogether omits to refer to pravaras. It may be contended that Manu also uses the word gotra in a wide sense--the sense in which Baudhāyana used it. On critically examining the verse, however, we may find the futility of the argument. Manu's rule of exogamy is made applicable not only to the Brahmins, but to all twice-born people. We must not lose sight of the word Dvija—twice-born—occurring in the second line of the verse. It is true, no doubt, that Manu sometimes means only Brahmins, and not the first three castes by the expression 'Dvija'; but the word Dvija is not used here in its narrow sense. The verses that follow will clear that point. Whenever Manu wants to make a rule applicable to Brahmins alone, he uses the word Vipra or Brāhmaṇa. Whenever separate rules are applicable to the first three castes, after stating the rule, Manu takes care to define the caste to which the rule is applicable. Thus, regarding the Upanayana ceremony, different rules are prescribed for different castes. In the whole of Manu–Smṛiti, as no other rule of exogamy is found, the rule, as given in the verse, is applicable to all the three castes, that were entitled to the thread ceremony. Thus, making the law applicable to the three castes, what did Manu exactly mean by the word gotra?

All the commentators of Manu tell us that gotra means an exogamous group, formed on the basis of the similarity of pravaras. But, how the commentators interprete the word is of very little importance to us, when we remember that Medhātithi, the earliest commentator of Manu whose work is available to us, wrote his commentary some one thousand years after the present version of Manu-Smṛiti was compiled. Medhātithi wrote, when the rule of sept exogamy was made quite rigid

and quite comprehensive. In Medhātithi's days, the currency of the rule was fully established. Marriage with a girl of the same pravara was strictly forbidden and universally abhorred. Writing his commentary under such circumstances, Medhātithi interpretes gotra in the wide sense, in which Baudhāyana used it, as far as the Brahmins were concerned; but when the rule is explained in connection with the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas to whom it is equally applicable, Medhātithi was confronted with a problem which he could not satisfactorily solve. The Sūtra-writers are emphatic in their declaration that the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas have no gotras, because they have no pravaras. I may repeat again that gotra originally meant nothing beyond the family name or surname. On the evidence of Baudhāyana himself, there were millions and millions of gotras. Baudhāyana or some one before him organized the millions of gotras under a few heads on the basis of the pravaras that each family recited. From that time, gotra became a sanctified term with a very wide meaning. The Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas were not allowed to participate in this internal organization of the Brahmin community, and so the Brāhmaṇa works and Sūtra works insistently told the two castes that they had no gotras, because they were not entitled to recite any pravaras of their own. The word 'gotra,' used by Manu, must, therefore, be understood in its original sense of family or family name. Medhātithi also has to admit it. He suggests that in the case of Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas, the word gotra should be interpreted in the sense of family; or the rule of Gautama that marriage should take place beyond seven generations among the relations on the father's side, should be allowed to operate. The second alternative of Medhātithi is not certainly an explanation of the word gotra. He thinks that because Ksha-

triyas and Vaiśyas lack the Ārsheya gotras i.e the Brahmanical gotras, they should be allowed to marry beyond seven generations from the father's side and five generations from the mother's side. In other words, sapiṇḍa exogamy should suffice the Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas. Medhātithi's alternative suggestion of observing only the sapiṇḍa exogamy by the Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas lends support to the theory that the Indo-Aryans in early Vedic times were not governed by any law of sept exogamy, but they had established or were establishing only the sapiṇḍa exogamy, which they perhaps did not practise in their Indo-Iranian home.

My own view of the matter is that Manu used the word gotra in the specific sense of family, applicable to all the three castes. If gotra meant one thing for the Brahmins and another thing for the other two castes, Manu naturally would have made it clear. On the occasion of the thread ceremony, he prescribes different kinds of sacred sticks for the students of different castes.[15] They are invested with sacred thread at different ages.[16] Even on the subject of marriage, whenever he so requires it, he differentiates among the three twice-born castes. Thus, a Brahmin and a Kshatriya must not think of a Śūdra wife. A girl belonging to the Śūdra class may do for a Vaiśya[17]. In the same way, from among the eight marriage forms, Manu has recommended particular forms for particular castes[18]. From all these considerations, it may be clearly seen that Manu propounded a uniform rule for all the three castes and his expression gotra simply means a family or family name.

15 Manu. II —45.
16 Manu. II —36.
17 Manu. III—13, 14.
18 Manu. III—23, 24.

Manu does not prescribe any penance or penalty for Sagotra Marriage

The next point is the consideration of the consequences that followed the violation of the rule of sept exogamy, as laid down by Manu. In the whole work of Manu, we fail to find any forcible denunciation of the violation of the rule, though such denunciation is a common feature with many other Smṛitis. The tenth chapter of Manu-Smṛiti is devoted to the description of how the mixed castes arose. A twice-born who is not invested with the sacred thread before a particular age becomes a Vrātya, or something like an outcast. Manu has defined the sub-castes of the progeny of the Vrātyas belonging to different castes. He has also named, in detail, the issues resulting from pratiloma marriage—marriage between a low caste bridegroom and a high caste bride. Thus, the issue from a Śūdra husband and the Brahmin wife is called a Chāṇḍāla. It is a noteworthy fact, however, that Manu does not describe a class of people arising from sagotra marriage. It might be said that sagotra marriages were very rare in Manu's times—a controversial proposition in itself—but, granting that such marriages were very rare, it may be pointed out that marriage between a Brahmin woman and a Śūdra husband was rarer still; and Manu is careful to name the breed born of such union. In later Smṛiti works, the issue of a sagotra union is styled as Chāṇḍāla. The eleventh chapter of Manu-Smṛiti prescribes expiations for great sins and minor sins. Violation of the Guru's—preceptor's—bed is considered the worst sin in all Smṛiti works. Gautama lays down that the guilt of him who has intercourse with the wife of a friend, a sister, a female belonging to the same gotra, the wife of a pupil, a daughter-in-law, or with a cow is as great as that of him who

violates his Guru's bed[19]. Manu also considers the sin of knowing a friends' wife, a son's wife and a uterine-sister, on a par with the sin of polluting Guru's bed[20]. Here, the absence of the word 'sagotra' is very significant. The next verse of Manu enumerates the three first cousins that an intelligent person should not marry; but not a word about the sagotra girl. Every possible case of the illegal or immoral emission of the seminal seed is mentioned and condemned. But complete silence has been observed regarding the union with a sagotra woman. In the same chapter, Manu gives a list of Upa-pātakas or minor sins. In that list (a) adultery, (b) marriage of the younger before the elder, (c) officiating on the occasion of such marriage, (d) violation of the modesty of a girl, (e) break of celibacy by a student etc. find place[21]; but curiously enough, Manu does not speak of the sin of sagotra marriage. It seems that, according to Manu, sagotra marriage does not constitute a sin—neither serious nor minor—Manu speaks in the strongest terms against the Āsura form of marriage in which the bride is purchased by money[22]. In the third chapter of Manu, the Brahmins that are unfit to be fed on the occasion of the Śrāddha ceremony are mentioned[23]. In that list also occur the names of the son of a widow re-married, the husband of a widow re-married, the younger ones who anticipate their elders and the elder ones so superseded. However, neither the husband of a woman married to a sagotra person, nor the issue from such a marriage, is mentioned. I have been compelled to quote so copiously from Manu, only to show that the violation of the rule

19 Gautama. XXIII—12; S. B. E. Vol. II. p. 285.

20 Manu. XI—170.

21 Manu. XI—59-66.

22 Manu. III--51-53.

23 Manu. III-- 150-167.

of exogamy, as preached by Manu, was not considered by him a serious sin—hardly a sin at all. Had he considered it a sin of some magnitude, at least once he would have mentioned it.

That Manu's rule of exogamy was loose and elastic is further seen from the commentary of Medhātithi. In his comments on the eleventh verse of the third chapter of Manu, the commentator makes some general observations. Medhātithi, following Manu, opines that the marriage with a sagotra girl should be considered as not at all performed; and so a sagotra girl, even though she may have gone through the sacramental rites, shall be given up. "Even though in reality, what such marriage involves is only a discrepancy in the rite, caused by the transgression of one of the interdictions relating to a subsidiary detail, and it does not involve any sin on part of a man—yet the expiatory rite has to be performed in view of its being directly enjoined by the scriptures. In connection with such marriages, expiatory rites have been prescribed by Vasishṭha, and other revered writers[24]." Thus, Medhātithi was of opinion that, according to Manu-Smṛiti, observance of the rule of exogamy was only a subsidiary detail of a valid marriage, and the breach of the rule was to be expiated, not because Manu considered it necessary, but because other revered Smṛiti-writers had ordained expiation for sagotra marriage.

The Rule of Sept Exogamy in Sūtra Works

We must now examine how the mild and the elastic rule of sept exogamy, as propounded by Manu, in course of time, assumed its present rigidity and comprehensiveness. Turning to the Sūtra works, we find that Āśvalāyana is studiously silent about the exogamous restrictions.

24 Manu-Smṛiti, Translated by G. Jha. Vol. II. Part I. p. 34.

In the closing chapters of his Śrauta-Sūtra he mentions the various pravaras, but that is done there in connection with the satras or the communal sacrifices. A Pariśishṭa or appendix has been added to the Śrauta-Sūtra, in which we are told that sept exogamy is to be based upon the pravaras that are already enumerated by Āśvalāyana. However, as far as ancient Sanskrit literature is concerned, it is generally granted, as a rule, that appendices to the original works are added at a later date. In the Āśvalāyana Gṛihya-Sūtra, a number of rules are given as to the selection of the bride. The famous form of testing the girl, by making her choose from among the eight kinds of earths taken from different places is given in great detail in the Gṛihya-Sūtra.[25] Āśvalāyana emphasises that the bridegroom must be young and intelligent, and the bride must be intelligent, beautiful and moral.[26] Āśvalāyana, however, does not say a word about the gotra of the bride and the bridegroom; far less about their pravaras. In the Laghu-Āśvalāyana-Dharma-Sūtra or Smṛiti which has been published in the Ānandāśrama series, we fail to get any reference to sept exogamy. This Laghu-Āśvalāyana-Smṛiti, however, need not be seriously considered at all. It is a metrical composition, and from its language it seems to have been written quite recently. But the complete absence of any reference to sept exogamy in the Āśvalāyana-Gṛihya-Sūtra cannot be easily ignored. Another noteworthy fact in connection with the Āśvalāyana-Gṛihya-Sūtra is that in its Pariśishṭa—appendix and the Kārikās of Kumārila which also form an appendix of the main work, the rule of sept exogamy is clearly mentioned. This shows that the writers of the appendices felt the neces-

25 Ā. Gṛi. I—5-5.
26 Ā. Gṛi. I—5-2, 3.

sity of incorporating the rule of exogamy in their writings; because by the time that the appendices were written, sept exogamy had been universally adopted by the Indo-Aryan community. Āśvalāyana who writes so exhaustively about the selection of the bride omits to mention the rule of exogamy, only because it was not yet universally accepted, or at least the sect that Āśvalāyana represented had not accepted it.

Though Āśvalāyana observes silence on the point of sept exogamy, Baudhāyana, Gautama, Āpastamba and Vasishṭha not only refer to the rule, but emphasise it. It will be interesting to study the point of view of each of the four Sūtra-writers on exogamy. Vasishṭha, while describing a proper bride, says that she must not belong to the same gotra or pravara. Thus, Vasishṭha, states the rule in a comprehensive form. But in his whole work he does not penalize the breach of the rule. A younger brother, anticipating the elder in marriage, is condemned and is asked by way of expiation to observe a Kṛichchhra penance.[27] The usual death penalty has been prescribed for the pollution of Guru's bed. He next proceeds to give the following rule as to the improper sexual connection. "If one has intercourse with a female venerable in the family, with a female friend, with the female friend of a Guru, with an Apapātra female, or with an outcast, he shall perform a Kṛichchhra penance for three months."[28] If Vasishṭha had so meant, he would have certainly added the word 'sagotrā'—a female belonging to the same gotra. Medhātithi has observed in his commentary on Manu that Vasishṭha has prescribed expiatory penances for sagotra marriage; but in the work of Vasishṭha that has come down to us, we fail to find that reference.

27 Vasishṭha. XX—8.

28 Vasishṭha. XX—16; S. B. E. Vol. XIV. p. 104.

Āpastamba also, in his Gṛihya-Sūtra, speaks not a word about sept exogamy, although he has written not less than ten Sūtras to describe the qualifications of a proper bride.[29] After giving the various qualifications of the bride, Āpastamba declares at the close of the chapter that some are of the opinion that prosperity attends the marriage with a girl on whom one's eye and mind are fixed.[30] In his Dharma-Sūtra, Āpastamba lays down, "He shall not give his daughter to a man belonging to the same gotra."[31] This is the only isolated remark that we find in Āpastamba's work, referring to sept exogamy. Neither a penance nor a penalty is provided for the violation of the rule of sept exogamy.

With Baudhāyana and Gautama, the case is much different. They not only enunciate the rule of sept exogamy, but prescribe penances of more or less serious character for disobeying the rule. In his Mahāpravarādhyāya, Baudhāyana states the rule of exogamy as well as the penalty for breaking the rule. "One should observe a Lunar penance, if he cohabits with a girl from his own gotra. The Brahmin woman, so married, should not be abandoned, but should be protected like the mother. The issue of such a union, if there be one, is not polluted. He is called a Kaśyapa"[32] In his Dharma-Sūtra, Baudhāyana does not prescribe any penance for the mere act of sagotra marriage. Sexual connection with the woman, so married, should be stopped, and she should be protected like the mother. In the case where the union results in an issue, a Kṛichchhra penance of three months should be performed.[33] After mentioning the

29 Āpas. Gṛi. III—(10-20).
30 Āpas. Gṛi. III—20.
31 Āpas. Ḍha. II—11-15; S. B. E. Vol. II. p. 126.
32 Pravara-Mañjarī, p. 136.
33 Bau. Dha. II—1-37, 38.

penance for sagotra marriage, Baudhāyana deals with a younger brother, marrying before the elder, and in this connection he holds equally guilty the five persons—the offending younger brother, the superseded elder brother, the bride, the donor of the bride and finally the priest who officiated on such an occasion—these five persons are condemned to hell, or in the alternative they have to observe a Kṛichchhra penance covering twelve days.[34] It is clear from the above Sūtra that Baudhāyana viewed the marriage of the younger before the elder more sinful than a sagotra marriage; because as far as a sagotra marriage is concerned, only the sexual connection between persons, so married, is prohibited, but the woman is not considered guilty, nor those who give her in marriage, nor the officiating priest. Baudhāyana has given us a list of Mahāpātakins—great sinners and Upapātakins—secondary sinners;[35] and in both these lists, a person, marrying in the gotra, is not mentioned.

Among the ancient Sūtra-writers, it is Gautama alone, who states the rule of sept exogamy, exclusively in the terms of pravaras. He lays down that marriage can take place with one who does not belong to the same pravaras.[36] Thus, the rule is stated in its widest scope, and what is more, its observance is not a pious recommendation. Gautama considers the violation of the rule of sept exogamy, equivalent to the sin of violating the Guru's bed,[37] although he is careful to record the milder view, held on this point by other authorities. "Some declare that the guilt of such a sinner is equal to that of a student who breaks the vow of chastity.[38]"

34 Bau. Dha. II—1-39-40.
35 Bau. Dha. II—2—(1-14).
36 Gautama. IV—2.
37 Gautama. XXIII—12.
38 Gautama. XXIII—13; S. B. E. Vol. II. p. 285.

Turning to minor Sūtra works, marriage outside the gotra has been insisted upon in the Gobhila-Gṛihya-Sūtra.[39] In the Mānava-Gṛihya-Sūtra[40] and in the Gṛihya-Sūtra of Hiraṇyakeśin[41] sept exogamy is mentioned; while Pāraskara-Gṛihya-Sūtra is silent on the point. In the Kāṭhaka-Gṛihya-Sūtra, the bride is directed to be examined as to the auspicious or inauspicious signs on her body by a palmist ; or the test of the bride's luck is proposed with the help of the eight balls of earth.[42] The author, however, keeps silent on the question of sept exogamy.

We have now seen what the various Sūtra-writers have to say in connection with sept exogamy. Writers like Āśvalāyana altogether do not state the rule, either on the narrow basis of gotra or the wide basis of pravara. It may be contended that this omission should not be taken seriously. After all the Gṛihya-Sūtra is not the proper place where we may reasonably expect the enunciation of the rule of sept exogamy. If the objection were really valid, there was no necessity of supplementing the Pravarādhyāya and the Gṛihya-Sūtra with appendices giving the rule of sept exogamy in full. Vasishṭha mentions the rule, but does not penalize its non-observance. Baudhāyana's tone is rather emphatic; he condemns a sagotra marriage, prescribes a Lunar penance for the sinner, and recommends the woman so married for protection as the mother. It is Gautama alone who speaks in scathing terms of sagotra marriage, and keeps it on a par with the violation of Guru's bed. Manu's view on the rule of sept exogamy has already been treated in full in foregoing pages.

39 Go. Gṛi. III—4-4.
40 Mā. Gṛi. I—7-8.
41 Hi. Gṛi. I—19-2.
42 Kāṭha. Gṛi. 14-3, 4.

From the consideration of various Sūtra works and also Manu's work, we may reasonably draw the conclusion that the rule of sept exogamy, as propounded in all these works, seems to be a social law that was yet in formation. Many Sūtra-writers saw the necessity of recording the rule; while Āśvalāyana omitted to notice it. Āśvalāyana's omission to mention the rule need not be taken to mean that sept exogamy was altogether unknown to the Indo-Aryan in Āśvalāyana's days; because Āśvalāyana so declares in his Gṛihya-Sūtra: "Various indeed are the customs of different countries, and customs of different villages. These one should observe at the wedding."[43] This will explain us how Āśvalāyana did not think it necessary to mention the rule of sept exogamy, while Gautama, almost a contemporary writer with him, not only enunciates the rule, but makes it compulsory and penalizes its non-observance. The rule of sept exogamy was not a political law, nor was it a social legislation passed and enforced by a political power. And so it was only by slow degrees that the whole of the Aryan community could be persuaded to embrace sept exogamy, it being a new idea to the Aryan mind. Even by government legislation, it is impossible to enforce such a law universally, unless a large portion of the community is prepared for it. India lacked in those days any central political power; and it was only by moral persuasion that an opinion could be created in favour of sept exogamy. Even the Sūtra-writers and legislators may be divided on the point of the advisibility and the necessity of adopting sept exogamy. Thus only, are the various views of the ancient Sūtra-writers explicable. On reading Gautama-Dharma-Sūtra if one concludes that sept exogamy in the days of Gautama was a universally accepted rule

43 Ā Gṛi. I—7-1; S. B. E. Vol. XXIX. p. 167.

and its breach was an unthinkable sin, such a conclusion will be only a partial truth. On the other hand, if another person maintains that sept exogamy was unknown to the Indo-Aryans, because some Sūtra-writers like Āśvalāyana omitted to mention it, that conclusion also is open to doubt. The truth lies midway. The principle of sept exogamy was there. Some had adopted it in full. Some may have been wavering; while a few might have been averse to it. Such is the state of things seen from the Sūtra works collectively.

The Scope of the Rule of Sept Exogamy

We must now consider the scope of the rule of sept exogamy that was being introduced or had been very recently introduced in Sūtra times. The scope is to be considered from two points of view. First, I shall consider the comprehensiveness of the rule. In other words, the exact meaning of the word gotra must be determined. Was it the technical gotra, as defined by Baudhāyana, or the gotra in its ordinary sense of family name? If we come to the conclusion that gotra implied nothing more than family name, we shall have to further consider up to what generations the family relationship was recognized. From a passage in the Taittirīya Saṁhitā, from a verse in the Parāśara-Smṛiti, as well as from the fact that Gautama who is considered the oldest Sūtra-writer quotes from Manu, I have tried to show that Manu was the first law-giver of the Indo-Aryans; and even in the rather recent version of Manu-Smṛiti that comes down to us, a large portion of the original code and especially on the subject of marriage has been kept unaltered. As explained already, gotra, as Manu understood it, meant simply a family or a family name. As Manu's rule of exogamy is applicable to all the three classes of the Indo-Aryans, gotra could not mean any-

thing else; because the Brāhmaṇa works have denied the privilege of reciting their own pravaras to the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas, and as has been made clear in this work on more than one occasion, that gotra, which lacks the basis of the pravaras, is the ordinary surname. In this narrow sense only, the rule could be made applicable to the three castes. When the rule was first enunciated, in all probability, the Brahmins had not assumed their spiritual gotras in the sense of Baudhāyana.

Thus, sept exogamy at its first appearance among the Indo-Aryans was based upon the very restricted sense of gotra. But what did the gotra actually signify in its restricted sense? What was really meant when it was said that the bride should not belong to the same gotra as that of the bridegroom? In defining death impurities Manu declared that the sapiṇḍa relationship ceases in the seventh generation, while the Samānodakabhāva ceases when the descent and the name are no longer known[44]. In another place, Manu says that Piṇḍa is offered only to three generations[45], and generations beyond the third are called Sakulyas (members of the same family). Baudhāyana has defined both the words sapiṇḍa as well as Sakulya. Sapiṇḍa is a very generic term, and sapiṇḍa relationship extends to seven generations. Three generations get the undivided oblations; while the next three generations which are called Sakulyas receive only the divided oblations[46]. Now, as Baudhāyana is a very ancient writer, we may be justified in holding that the ancient Manu understood the word Sakulya in the sense in which Baudhāyana understood it. It seems that for the purpose of inheritance, family relationship ceased

44 Manu. V—60.

45 Manu. IX—186.

46 Bau. Dha. I—11-9, 10.

in the seventh generation, while for the purpose of exogamy, family relationship was to be recognized as long as Samānodakabhāva existed i.e. as long as the descent and name were known.

Before proceeding further, it is necessary to consider the castes that were governed by this new rule. Among the Indo-Aryans, Brahmins had reserved for themselves all intellectual pursuits. They were the leaders of all castes, in matters spiritual and social; and as such, they had themselves first to adopt sept exogamy, before they preached it to other castes, or forced it upon other castes. The Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas may not have quite readily accepted the new restrictions. By slow degrees, however, the whole of the Indo-Aryan community was made amenable to the restrictions, laid down under the rule of sept exogamy.

It is a matter of common experience in the world that puritanism and a life governed by rigid rules always help to create a sense of superior moral greatness. The Brahmin was always solicitous for the recognition of his moral greatness, not only by the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas, but even by the non-Aryan races. While considering gotras and pravaras, I have shown that they were the basis of the internal organization of the Brahmin caste, and Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas had no room in that organization. The Brāhmaṇas declare that the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas were not entitled to recite their independent pravaras. In every ceremonial, differentiation was made between Brahmins on one hand and the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas on the other. The Brahmin decided that he should surpass all others in the rigidity and the comprehensiveness of the rule of exogamy as applied to him. The Brahmin community was already organized under the pravara system, and the Sūtra-writers laid down

that as far as the Brahmin community was concerned, marriage should not take place between persons reciting the same pravaras. It is true that the Sūtras have nowhere told directly that pravara exogamy was meant only for Brahmins. But the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas were unequivocally debarred from claiming independent pravaras; and it followed that the pravara exogamy was applicable to Brahmins alone. Members of the other two castes were directed to marry outside their family.

The pravara exogamy was far more comprehensive than the gotra or family exogamy that was applicable to the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas. Excluding the two groups Kevala-Aṅgiras and Kevala-Bhṛigu, the similarity of even one pravara was considered sufficient to constitute sagotra relationship i.e. the relationship of belonging to the same gotra. That such a type of comprehensive exogamy was exclusively preached for Brahmins may be inferred from Baudhāyana's work. He observes: "If one unknowingly marries a sagotra girl, he should protect the Brahmin wife like his mother; the issue of such a union should be styled Kaśyapa.[47]" The expression 'Brahmin wife' suggests that the rule applies only to Brahmins. The same thing is indicated from the declaration that the issue of such a union should belong to Kaśyapa gotra. It was the Brahmin alone who cared for, and who was entitled to hold the gotra. Other castes were not allowed to claim a gotra; nor were they very anxious about it.

The extremely comprehensive character of the pravara exogamy not only demonstrated the superior moral tone of the Brahmin community, but it served one more purpose. When the Brahmins said that the Kshatriyas

---

47 Pravara-Mañjarī, p. 136.

and Vaiśyas had no pravaras, what they really meant was that Brahmins alone were descended from the great Ṛishis of the past; while the Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas could not claim that proud descent or tradition. This contention of the Brahmins that they were the direct descendants of the pravara Ṛishis must have excited the keen jealousy of the Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas, and especially of the former, who never meekly submitted to the Brahmin pretentions. When the principle of sept exogamy was being introduced among the Indo-Aryans, an excellent opportunity presented itself to the Brahmin to prove that his claim of descent from the pravara Ṛishis was genuine and not fictitious. Thus, while the two other castes were prevented from marrying a girl from the same family, the Brahmin was prohibited from marrying a girl, even if there was one common pravara Ṛishi belonging to the two families. In this way the Brahmin tried to convince others that he was really connected with the pravara Ṛishis by blood.

Now, it remains to consider how far the rule of sept exogamy was rigid in Sūtra times. To what extent was the violation of the rule considered a sin? In recent Smṛiti works the sagotra marriage is condemned in the strongest terms; but it does not seem that in Sūtra times such was the case. According to Baudhāyana, the progeny of such a union is not at all polluted, but is considered as belonging to Kaśyapa gotra. Neither the offending Brahmin nor the wife are put under any social stigma. Gautama is the only Sūtra-writer who compares the sagotra marriage with the pollution of Guru's bed. Gautama seems, however, to be an isolated authority, preaching extreme puritan cult, and recognized only in limited area by a limited number of people. One more thing must be remembered in connection with Gautama. Among a multitude of Smṛiti-writers and Sūtra

writers, he alone entertains an idealistic view about gotra and pravara relationship. No other legislator than Gautama admits to the inheritance of the deceased, the persons bearing the same gotra, and failing them, the people repeating the same pravaras. It seems that Gautama very sincerely believed that gotra and pravara relationship disclosed descent, and hence he considered a sagotra marriage highly sinful. Later Smṛitis have not only penalized the sagotra union, but they have branded the issue of such a marriage as Chāṇḍāla. Baudhāyana and other Sūtra-writers, including even Gautama, do not raise any objection against the admission of the issue of the sagotra union in the Brahmin community; and as long as the issue of the sagotra union was not branded in the society, we may safely take it for granted that the application of the rule was not very strict.

The Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas in the days of the Sūtra-writers, generally followed the rule of sept exogamy; but the restrictions were far from being rigid. This conclusion will be well borne out by a critical examination of the eight forms of marriage enumerated by the Sūtra and Smṛiti-writers. The Āsura and the Rākshasa forms of marriage are specially recommended for the Kshatriyas. The popularity of the Gāndharva form of marriage among the Kshatriyas is well known in the Purāṇas and the epics. Gāndharva marriage is love-marriage, while Rākshasa form of marriage is marriage by capture. The Āsura form of marriage implies the purchase of the bride by the bridegroom. Kshatriya princes were specially fond of allowing their daughters to select their husband at the Svayaṁvara ceremony. Sometimes the princess fixed her choice by her intuition upon some one in the assembly; while on occasions, there was a regular competition for the performance of some difficult feat, and the triumphant hero was subsequently

chosen by the princess for her husband. As is obvious, in all these forms of marriage, there was a great probability of the strict exogamous restrictions being sometimes overlooked. With the wider form of exogamy, based upon pravara, the Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas were never familiar; and they could not be familiar, as they were not the members of the pravara organization. The Sūtra-writers asked the Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas to borrow the gotra and pravara of their priest; but that was decidedly for sacrificial purposes. It is quite unnatural to believe that the Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas took for the basis of their exogamy the gotra and pravara borrowed from their priest. There is another difficulty in believing that the members of the two castes took into consideration the gotra and the pravara of the priests of the marrying parties on the occasion of settling a marriage. The priestly class of Brahmins was only a small fraction of the total population of the Indo-Aryans. One Brahmin officiated as a priest for scores of Kshatriya and Vaiśya families. It would be mere absurdity to think that scores of families did not intermarry merely because all of them had the same officiating priest. Medhātithi, who wrote in the ninth century, while explaining Manu's rule of exogamy, declares that Gautama's provision that marriage should take place beyond seven generations should be made operative in the case of the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas. If such was the mildness of the exogamous restrictions among the members of the two castes in the ninth century, one may imagine the looseness of the rule of sept exogamy, as applied to the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas in Sūtra times, when even the Brahmins had not fully imbibed the new cult.

CHAPTER VII

HISTORY OF SEPT EXOGAMY AFTER THE CHRISTIAN ERA

Sept Exogamy in the Smṛiti Works

I have followed the history of the progress of sept exogamy among the Indo-Aryans, roughly up to the beginning of the Christian era. It now remains to see how in after times the rather loose exogamous restrictions of the Sūtra times were hardened into inflexible rules, and the breach of these rules became an unthinkable sin. To trace the development of sept exogamy after Christ, we shall have to examine the writing of various Smṛiti-writers that wrote after the beginning of the Christian era. The foremost among such writers is Yājñavalkya. He lays down the rule of exogamy in unequivocal terms. The bride must not belong to the same gotra and pravara as that of the bridegroom[1]. Not only is the rule of sept exogamy stated in explicit terms by Yājñavalkya, but in his chapter on penances he lays down, "connection with a friend's wife, with a virgin, with a sister ....and with a sagotra girl should be considered as sinful as the violation of guru's bed.[2]" Thus, in Yājñavalkya we find the law of exogamy fully established; and hereafter its breach began to be considered a serious sin. Leaving Yājñavalkya whose date has been fixed as the third century A. D. or a century earlier, I shall turn to Nārada, a Smṛiti-writer of the fifth or sixth century. According to Nārada, a girl belonging to the same gotra, and reciting the same pravara, is ineligible for marriage. [3] The original Sanskrit verse in which Nārada

---

1 Yājñavalkya. Chapter on religious observances, 53.

2 Yājñavalkya. Chapter on penances, 231.

3 Nārada. XII—7.

describes a marriageable girl runs thus:

Āsaptamāt pañchamādvā bandhubhyaḥ pitṛimātṛitaḥ ।
Avivāhyā sagotrā syuḥ samānapravarā tathā [4] ॥

Dr. Jolly has translated the verse as follows: "Sagotras and samānapravaras are ineligible for marriage up to the fifth and seventh degrees of relationship respectively, on the father's and mother's side[5]." Evidently, Dr. Jolly's translation of the verse is incorrect. The verse clearly embodies two sorts of exogamous restrictions—restrictions based upon sapiṇḍa relationship and restrictions based upon sagotra and samānapravara relationship. Every Sūtra and Smṛiti writer insists, with equal force, on the observance of the two forms of exogamous restrictions; because the rules of sept and sapiṇḍa exogamy are equally important.

According to Dr. Jolly's translation of the verse, sagotra and samānapravara relations up to the fifth and seventh degree from the father's and the mothers' side are to be avoided in marriage. Thus, the verse preaches neither sept exogamy nor sapiṇḍa exogamy in its proper form. Principles of sept exogamy admit no limitation of degrees of relationship, either five or seven. Rules of sapiṇḍa exogamy exclude agnatic and cognatic relations of both the father and the mother up to certain generations. If Dr. Jolly's interpretation is taken to be correct, agnatic relations of the father and the mother up to certain generations will be excluded; but there will be no objection to marry the nearest cognatic relation of either the father or the mother.

There is another absurdity to which we are driven by Dr. Jolly's translation of the verse. How are we to count the five and seven generations of the sagotras and

4 "Institutes of Nārada," (Jolly's edition, 1885), p. 173.
5 S. B. E. Vol. XXXIII. p. 166.

samānapravaras of the father and the mother? As I have made abundantly clear in the previous chapters, after using the word 'sagotra,' the use of the word samānapravara in the text is almost redundant. It is the recitation of common pravara that establishes the sagotra relationship. Nārada-Smṛiti was compiled in the fifth or sixth century. At least a thousand years earlier, Brahmanical gotras or surnames were arranged on the basis of the pravaras; and exogamy was based upon these newly created units. How was it possible for a Brahmin, in the days of Nārada-Smṛiti, to calculate five and seven generations of sagotra and samānapravara persons? Sagotra relationship presupposes its existence from the remotest antiquity. Kindred relationship must not be confused with sept or clan relationship. Kindreds are always defined by degrees.. Absence of limit is the essence of clan or sept relationship.

As a matter of fact, the verse does not mean anything more than the accepted and orthodox rule of sept exogamy. The first line of the verse recommends the exclusion of the sapiṇḍa relations on the father's and mother's side up to seven and five generations. The second line insists on the exclusion of sagotra and samānapravara persons. Thus, Nārada's rule of exogamy is quite in harmony with the rule of other writers. There is nothing particular or peculiar in his rule, except, perhaps, the word 'bandhubhyaḥ,' used in the first line, relying on which later writers advocated further extension of sapiṇḍa exogamy. As we shall have to discuss that point fully at a later stage., I have to content myself here simply by mentioning the point. I may add, however, that Dr. Jolly has altogether ignored the word, 'bandhubhyaḥ,' in his translation. Nārada further lays down that union with a sagotra girl is a sin for which no other punishment than excision of the organ is con-

sidered adequate[6]. Vishṇu-Smṛiti which is also a contemporary work with Nārada condemns sagotra marriage[7]; while Bṛihaspati, another contemporary writer, whose work is mainly concerned with the legal proceedings, writes nothing on the topic of exogamous restrictions. One fact is clearly observed from the writings of Yājñavalkya, Nārada and Vishṇu. They all condemn sagotra marriage and penalize it, but none of them declares that the issue of such a union is Chāṇḍāla, which is a favourite formula with the writers of later times.

The next great original Smṛiti-writer is Parāśara. Regarding his exact date, our information is very meagre and inconclusive. Yājñavalkya mentions his name among the great Smṛiti-writers that preceded him. But the Parāśara, mentioned in Yājñavalkya-Smṛiti, must not be confounded with the writer of the Parāśara-Smṛiti that has been preserved to us, and which has been exhaustively commented upon by Mādhava. Parāśara himself declares that his work is specially meant for the Kali age.[8] Thus, from his own evidence Parāśara seems to be a recent writer. Medhātithi who flourished in the ninth century mentions Parāśara-Smṛiti, and though we are not sure to what Parāśara he refers, in all probability he must be referring to the present Parāśara-Smṛiti; because Mādhava wrote his famous commentary on Parāśara in the fourteenth century, and by that time Parāśara must have been considered an ancient and authoritative writer. So we may place Parāśara some time previous to Medhātithi. Parāśara does not say anything as to the duties to be performed in the four Āśramas of life; and so, on the question of sept exogamy he has written nothing.

6 Nārada. XII–73, 75.
7 Vishṇu. XXIV–9.
8 Parāśara. 1–24.

The trend of his thought may, however, be gathered from his chapter on penances. For a sagotra marriage he prescribes rather a light penance—performance of three Prājāpatya penances and the gift of two cows to Brahmins; but the seriousness of the sin may be guaged, when we take into consideration that Parāśara, while prescribing a light penance for sagotra marriage, places it on a level with the carnal knowledge of the father's wife other than one's own mother, Guru's wife, son's wife and the maternal uncle's wife[9]. A careful examination of Parāśara's chapters on penances will show that he prescribes very lenient penances for sins of whatever magnitude.

Parāśara-Smṛiti is the last original Smṛiti work that has come down to us intact. Between Manu and Parāśara, Smṛitis were written by scores. Yājñavalkya mentions not less than twenty promulgators of Dharma-Śāstra. The Vīramitrodaya records in all fifty Smṛiti-writers. "In the Nirṇayasindhu alone, Kamalākara refers to 131 Smṛitis, while Anantadeva in his Saṁskāra-Kaustubha quotes 104 Smṛitis. Besides these, other Smriti passages are given but their authors are not named.[10]"

Unfortunately most of these Smṛitis are lost to us; some are found in fragments, while some are to be traced from the writings of great commentators, and from the Smṛiti-digests by recent writers. The dates of these various Smṛiti-writers cannot be ascertained with any degree of accuracy; because in almost all cases there has been more than one writer of the same name. Then there are different readings current in different provinces; while in certain cases, there are deliberate interpolations in the original text. Under these circumstances, the most advisable thing to do would be to ignore altogether

9 Parāśara. X—13, 14.

10 Mandlik, "Vyavahāra-Mayūkha," p. XIX.

the fragments of Smṛitis, the genuineness of whose texts cannot be guaranteed. From the works of commentators and digest-writers who flourished after the eighth century, we may, however, get some idea as to the opinions of the lost Smṛiti-writers on particular topics.

The Rule of Sept Exogamy in the Works of Commentators

When new Smṛitis ceased to be composed, the work of writing commentaries on ancient Smṛitis began in right earnest. Some of these commentaries are so famous that they have easily thrown into the background the original works, and have themselves become the standard works on Hindu law for generations to come. All commentators could not attain the same degree of popularity; but one common thing may be observed in the case of all the commentators. None of them feels content with the mercenary work of explaining the original texts word by word; but they all try to interprete the original text in such a way as would suit the changed times. The commentators quote freely from ancient as well as contemporary works, and sometimes from a muffle of varying opinions they establish a particular view that suited their taste, or rather the taste of the times they lived in. The original law on which they commented was sometimes to be supplemented by the edicts of other Smṛiti-writers; sometimes a forced interpretation was to be put on it, and sometimes it was found necessary to ignore the original law completely. The last thing was achieved by the commentators by declaring that a particular rule or set of rules was applicable only to the ages other than the Kali age, and it could not hold good in the present age. Thus, it will be seen that though the activities of the original Smṛiti-writers ceased in the seventh or eighth century after Christ, Hindu Law was modified from time

to time by the commentators on ancient works. Just as the Hindu Law, as preached by the Smṛitis, commentators and Nibandhas, is generally accepted by the courts of law in India, and at the same time suitable modifications are introduced by the judges to keep pace with the changed circumstances of the people, in the same way the commentators, while interpreting the ancient law, always bore in mind that they were not engaged in an academical discussion, but they were explaining the law with reference to the conditions of a living society. In this sense, commentators are to some extent independent writers in the legal literature of the Hindus.

The first great commentator is Asahāya. He commented on Nārada-Smṛiti. A greater portion of Asahāya's commentary is lost. A fragment of the commentary that is still preserved is yet unpublished and I have not been able to refer to it. But as the Nārada-Smṛiti deals mainly with criminal and civil law, Asahāya's commentary will not be any way helpful to us in examining the gradual development of the rule of sept exogamy. The next great commentator is Viśvarūpa who wrote his commentary Bālakrīdā on Yājñavalkya at the beginning of the ninth century. He explains the expression 'Asamānārshagotrajām' as a girl not belonging to the same pravaras. Viśvarūpa observes that the expression 'Asagotra', used by Manu, should be understood to mean 'Asamānapravara[11].' His comments on Yājñavalkya's verse "carnal knowledge of the friend's wife, a maiden, a sister, a Chāṇḍāla woman, a sagotra woman and son's wife, is known to be on a level with the violation of the Guru's bed," are very brief. Here also, he quotes Manu in support of Yājñavalkya[12]. It is worth noticing that

11 Viśvarūpa, part I. p. 61
12 Viśvarūpa, part II. p. 91.

Viśvarūpa, while explaining the rule of sept exogamy, or while explaining the penance for its non-observance, cites as an authority only Manu whose rule of exogamy, as observed previously, is rather lax. Medhātithi, almost a contemporary of Viśvarūpa, interpretes Manu's rule of gotra exogamy in a comprehensive way; but Medhātithi is certainly at a loss to explain the word sagotra, in connection with the Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas. Manu lays down the rule in explicit terms for all twice-born people. So, Medhātithi contents himself by declaring that the word 'gotra' in connection with the Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas should be understood to mean a family or a family name. Manu, as has been shown already, recommends marriage outside the gotra; but he does not so much condemn marriage within the gotra. Medhātithi observes, if the bride belongs to the gotra of the bridegroom, it is a discrepancy in the rite, caused by the transgression of one of the interdictions relating to a subsidiary detail; and it does not involve any sin on the part of the man who marries the sagotra girl. From Medhātithi's observations it follows that he advised expiatory penances for a sagotra marriage, not because either Manu or he thought them necessary, but because other Smṛiti-writers had prescribed such expiatory penances. Medhātithi does not mention the social status of the issue of such a union; but from the tone of his writing it may be inferred that he would not have certainly declared the progeny of a sagotra union as belonging to the Chāṇḍāla caste.

Curiously enough, Medhātithi proposes the extension of sept exogamy in another direction, although he is not insistent on it. He, while explaining Manu's rule, quotes Vasishṭha as follows. "If a twice-born person marries a girl of the same gotra or the same pravara as

himself, he shall renounce her and perform the Lunar penance; so also, if he was married to the daughter of his maternal uncle, or a girl of the same gotra as his mother's". In the Vasishṭha-Dharma-Sūtra that has been translated in the S.B.E. series we do not find the verse. It must be, therefore, some other Vasishṭha to whom Medhātithi refers. He makes no remarks of his own on this new extension of sept exogamy. Some later commentators and digest-writers construe the famous verse of Manu, in such a way as to exclude the mother's gotra also, along with the father's gotra. Medhātithi does not follow this course. He interpretes the verse in the most natural way. The girl should not be a sapiṇḍa relation of the father as well as the mother, and at the same time she should not belong to the father's gotra. In as much as, however, Medhātithi quotes Vasishṭha to exclude also the mother's gotra, it seems that Manu's rule of sept exogamy was thought insufficient at least by a section of the people in the commentator's time. In every authoritative commentary and every digest-work, written after Medhātithi, the question of excluding the mother's gotra has been discussed. Some favour this extension of sept exogamy, others oppose it; but no writer of subsequent date fails to mention it. As Medhātithi does not discuss the mother's gotra in any detail in his commentary, I may conveniently defer its detailed consideration for a while.

Aparārka, a king from the Śilāhār dynasty, wrote his commentary on Yājñavalkya-Smṛiti in the twelfth century. Thus, Aparārka wrote his commentary two or three centuries later than Medhātithi. There is a marked difference in the treatment of the topic of sept exogamy by the two commentators. Though sagotra marriage is a null and void marriage, Medhātithi is frankly of opinion that the husband in such cases is free from

any guilt; and if he lays down any penance for a sagotra marriage, he does so in deference to the views of some ancient writers. Aparārka, on the other hand, holds a strong attitude on the point. He quotes Sumantu and Baudhāyana who prescribe the Lunar penance for a sagotra marriage. This much expiation is not, however, sufficient in the opinion of the commentator. He observes that when the sin is unintentional, the Lunar penance may prove sufficient; but where the sin is deliberate, the husband becomes a Patita—an outcast and it naturally follows that the son of an outcast must be an outcast.[13] While commenting on the verse 231 from the chapter on penances of Yājñavalkya, Aparārka remarks that, if there is no seminal effusion, the sin should be considered as of less magnitude than the sin of the violation of Guru's bed[14]. If we compare Aparārka's views on the question of sagotra marriage with the views of Vijñāneśvara who flourished in the same century, we will find that the same line of argument has been followed by both of them. As to the exclusion of the mother's gotra in marriage, Aparārka quotes a stray verse in support of the exclusion; but he does not attach any special importance to that view.

Another great commentator on Yājñavalkaya is Vijñāneśvara. In the long list of commentators on ancient Smṛitis, Vijñāneśvara is the most famous. His commentary called Ṛiju Mitāksharā or briefly the Mitāksharā is highly respected throughout India; and Hindu Law is interpreted and administered in courts of law, generally in accordance with this commentary. The original work of Yājñavalkya is almost forgotten, and Mitāksharā is regarded as quite an independent authority.

13 Aparārka, p. 80.
14 Aparārka, p. 1048.

According to Vijñāneśvara, gotra represents the well known family descent, and in marriage gotra and pravara must be avoided separately. The girl must not have descended from the same gotra, and must not belong to the same pravara. The expression "Asamānārshagotrajām", used by Yājñavalkya, is applicable only to the first three classes. But, as the Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas have no peculiar gotras of their own, they have no pravaras also; and as such, they have to borrow the gotra and pravara of their family priests. Vijñāneśvara cites the authority of Āśvalāyana; but Āśvalāyana's dictum is meant clearly for sacrificial purposes and not for the purpose of marriage. Writing two or three centuries earlier, Medhātithi had already made that point clear. The Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas were to observe the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy that excluded seven generations from the father's side and five generations from the mother's side, though the latter part of the rule was more often disobeyed than followed. I have already pointed out the absurd position that will be created if the gotras and pravaras of the family priest are borrowed for the purpose of marriage. As one Brahmin generaly acts as a family priest for the whole village, the total population of the village will belong to the same gotra and pravara; and marriage within the village will be an impossibility. It does not seem that this theory of borrowing the gotra and pravara of the priest, as preached by the commentators, was ever followed. Smṛiti-writers have given various qualifications with which the bride should be endowed. Which of these qualifications are essential and which are non-essential? Vijñāneśvara answers this question by declaring that the marriage with a sagotra, samāna-pravara and sapiṇḍa girl is void, and it fails to create the status of a wife; while other qualifications such as freedom from disease

etc. are non-essential, and their absence will not vitiate a marriage, though very bad results may be expected to follow from such unions.

As far as the exclusion of the mother's gotra is concerned, Mitāksharā is not very enthusiastic. Vijñāneśvara observes that some people hold the view that a girl having the gotra even of the mother should not be taken in marriage. The upholders of this principle relied on the following verse from the chapter on penance of Śātātapa. "Having married the mother's brother's daughter, or a girl having the mother's gotra, or one having the common pravara, one should abandon the wife and should perform a Lunar penance [15]." Vijñāneśvara records the view in his work, and passes on without any discussion of it. It should be further noted that Vijñāneśvara in the portion of his commentary, dealing with the expiatory penances, does not take into account the sin of marrying in the mother's gotra. We may reasonably conclude from this that the writer of Mitāksharā never accepted the principle, although he did not actually refute it. As Medhātithi, Aparārka and Vijñāneśvara have all of them recorded this new view of sept exogamy in their works, in spite of their disagreement with that view, it may be inferred that this new extension of sept exogamy was being systematically preached by a section of legislators, though the new principle does not seem to have been ever accepted by an appreciable section of the Brahmin community.

We must now turn to see what expiatory penances the Mitāksharā prescribes for the violation of the rule of sept exogamy. At the outset, Vijñāneśvara makes a distinction between an intentional breach of the rule of exogamy and an unintentional one; so also, he differen-

15 Mitāksharā, Book I. pp. 105, 106.

tiates between an occasional sin and a continuous sin. While commenting on the verse 231 from the chapter on penance of Yājñavalkya, he lays down that the sin of sagotra marriage will be comparable to the violation of Guru's bed, only when the seminal effusion is there; otherwise the sin will be expiated by a lighter penance. Vijñāneśvara quotes Nārada to the effect that the carnal knowledge of a sagotra girl can be expiated only by the excision of the male organ. Mitāksharā, however, makes an exception in favour of the Brahmins on whom no corporal punishment is to be inflicted. Relying on Manu, Vijñāneśvara proceeds—if one unintentionally cohabits with a Chāṇḍālī, he becomes an outcast, and he has to observe a penance of twelve years. If he intentionally lives in the company of a Chāṇḍālī for a long time, he actually turns into a Chāṇḍāla. If he cohabits with her one night, he must observe three years' penance. On the authority of another Smṛiti which he does not name, Vijñāneśvara illustrates the word 'Chāṇḍālī' by the following verse:—

Chāṇḍālī bandhakī veśyā rajasthā yā cha kanyakā ।
ūḍhā yā cha sagotrā syāt Vṛishalyaḥ pañcha kīrtitāḥ ॥

Chāṇḍālī and Vṛishalī are synonymous words, and this verse places a woman, married to a sagotra person, in the same category; and even a single connection with her requires a penance of three years. Mitāksharā then quotes a verse from Bṛihad-Yama that prescribes a mere Lunar penance for approaching a Chāṇḍālī, a sister, a maternal uncle's wife, a sagotra woman etc. Vijñāneśvara, however, clears the point by explaining that this light penance has been prescribed for those cases only, where the seminal effusion has not taken place. If the seminal effusion is there, the original penance, as prescribed by the commentator, will be operative[16]. Vijñā-

16 Mitāksharā, Book III. pp. 290-292.

neśvara does not define the status of the issue of a sagotra union; but as he considers a woman, married to a sagotra person, a Chāṇḍālī, it naturally follows that the son of a Chāṇḍālī must be a Chāṇḍāla. Baudhāyana, when he enunciated the rule of sept exogamy, declared that a man, marrying a sagotra girl, should abandon her as far as sexual life was concerned, but should protect her as his mother, and should perform a Lunar penance. The wife was not placed under any social boycott. The issue was not polluted, but was to belong to the Kaśyapa gotra. This was the law, as given by Baudhāyana, some five centuries before Christ in his Mahāpravarādhyāya. In his Dharma-Sūtra no penance is prescribed for the mere act of sagotra marriage; and a Kṛichchhra penance is to be performed for the birth of a son from the union. Fifteen hundred years had now elapsed, and gotra exogamy had assumed such a rigidity that Vijñāneśvara, writing in the twelfth century after Christ, condemned not only the man who married a sagotra girl, but the wife, and the issue as well. The sin was no longer to be expiated by a Lunar penance. For a single day's slip, a penance of three years was prescribed. Connection for a longer period threw the man into the Chāṇḍāla caste. As to the issue, he was by all means a Chāṇḍāla, as his mother was a Chāṇḍālī, in as much as she married a sagotra person.

Sept Exogamy in the Nibandha-Works

Smṛiti-Chandrikā is a Nibandha—work written in the Deccan by Devaṇa Bhaṭṭa in the thirteenth century. The Nibandhas are not considered inspired works like the ancient Smṛitis of Manu, Yājñavalkya and Parāśara. The old Smṛitis are very loose and irregular in their arrangement of subjects. In these Smṛitis, some subjects are exhaustively treated, while some are left quite

unnoticed. The Nibandha-writers, on the other hand, give the Hindu Law in quite a systematic form. They quote ancient authorities, and try to reconcile contradictory texts of various Smṛitis. After discussing a question from all sides, the Nibandha-writer gives his own conclusion; and in doing so, he is generally alive to the actual practices of the people. By a comparison of the old Smṛitis with the Nibandhas, written after the twelfth century, one may observe that the former are more or less idealistic works, while the latter seem to be written by practical men for practical purposes. Commentators like Vijñāneśvara and Mādhava also did the same thing, but their avowed purpose was to interprete one particular text, and they do not so much aspire to give the general law. Thus, it will be seen that the Nibandha-writer undertakes a more ambitious work than the commentator.

After the enunciation of the usual rule of sept exogamy, Devaṇa Bhaṭṭa proceeds that if a sagotra or sapravara marriage takes place, the wife should be abandoned as far as sexual life is concerned. He quotes Śātātapa who recommends a Lunar penance for sagotra marriage and the protection of the wife like the mother thereafter. Evidently, this light penance is prescribed for the mere act of marriage; but if sexual union takes place and a child is born, the following verse from Āpastamba provides for the situation:

Samānagotrapravarām kanyām ūḍhvā upagamya cha ।
tasyām utpādya Chāṇḍālam Brāhmaṇyāt eva hīyate ॥

This verse which is attributed by Devaṇa Bhaṭṭa to Āpastamba does not occur in his Dharma-Sūtra or his Gṛihya-Sūtra. Āpastamba wrote his Sūtra, a century or two later than Baudhāyana, and Baudhāyana requires only a Lunar penance for the expiation of a sagotra mar-

riage, while in his opinion the child is free from any blemish. In the course of a century or two, it is improbable that such a change in public opinion could take place as is disclosed in the alleged quotation from Āpastamba. In Pravara-Mañjarī[17] and in Aparārka's commentary[18] in connection with sept exogamy Āpastamba has been quoted; but that quotation is duly found in his Dharma-Sūtra. Purushottama, the author of Pravara-Mañjarī, has quoted Yama[19] and not Āpastamba to denounce the issue of a sagotra union. No other authoritative Smriti-writer has declared the issue of a sagotra union a Chāṇḍāla. The verse quoted by Devaṇa Bhaṭṭa must therefore be the work of some other recent Āpastamba. A metrical work called Āpastamba-Smṛiti is published in the Ānandāśrama Sanskrit series; and the work deals with expiatory penances for various sins. In this Āpastamba-Smṛiti also, the verse in question is not found. That Smṛiti prescribes merely a Lunar penance, for approaching a woman that ought not to be approached. The subject of sagotra marriage is not even incidentally mentioned. All subsequent Nibandha-writers have quoted the above verse or similar verses attributed to Baudhāyana, Yama, Bṛihad-Yama etc.

In respect of the mother's gotra, Devaṇa Bhaṭṭa quotes Vyāsa who observes that, "some object to the mother's gotra also in marriage." Smṛiti-Chandrikā, however, is not in favour of the exclusion of the mother's gotra. Devaṇa Bhaṭṭa was a resident of the Deccan and a great advocate of marriage with the maternal uncle's daughter. He could not, therefore, accept the principle of excluding the mother's gotra. He lays down that the rule of excluding the mother's gotra may be ope-

17 Pravara-Mañjarī, p. 6.
18 Aparārka. p. 82.
19 Pravara-Mañjarī, p. 7.

rative in those cases only, where the girl is offered in marriage as a Putrikā i.e. a girl whom her father offers in marriage on condition expressed or implied that her son should belong to him. In a regular Brāhma form of marriage the girl, as soon as she is married, loses her father's gotra and acquires the gotra of the husband. It is only in Āsura form of marriage and the Putrikā marriage that the original gotra of the girl is retained. So, when a girl is married according to the Brāhma form, in the case of her son's marriage, her gotra i.e. her father's gotra need not be taken into account.[20]

Hemādri is the writer of a voluminous work on Dharma-Śāstra, called Chaturvarga-Chintāmaṇi. Hemādri's date has been fixed as lying somewhere between 1260 and 1271. Hemādri quotes one Gautama (not the famous Sūtra-writer) and Mārkaṇḍeya, both of whom declare that, if sagotra marriage takes place through ignorance, the wife should be abandoned; but if some one continued in her company wilfully and for the satisfaction of lust, that person is to be considered a Mātṛigāmī—a wooer of the mother. If a son is born, he is, of course, a Chāṇḍāla. In case where a marriage takes place through ignorance, and there is no sexual union, a Lunar penance may be performed. If sexual union takes place, the sin is nothing short of Gurutalpa—the violation of Guru's bed. However, by way of expiatory penance, the excision of the male organ may not be inflicted. When a son is born, he is required to be burnt in the fire enkindled with dry cow dung. This burning in the fire was, of course, a mock burning. Thus, it seems that, although Hemādri declared a child of the sagotra union a Chāṇḍāla, the Chāṇḍālaship is more or less technical and he can be purified by the mock burning in the cow

20 Smṛiti-Chandrikā, part I. pp. 179-188.

dung fire. Hemādri is equally lenient with the person marrying a sagotra girl. The marriage is, of course, considered void, and the man may be purified by re-initiation. The woman may perform half the penance prescribed for the male. Thus, Hemādri condemns sagotra marriage, and condemns it in no equivocal terms. But he keeps the way open for the sinners to re-enter their society after the performance of a practicable penance. Vijñāneśvara also had prescribed a penance of twelve years for a long association with a sagotra woman. But a penance 'covering a period of twelve years' is hardly a penance within ordinary reach, and few at best among the sinners would hope to successfully finish the penance. On the other hand, re-initiation is a penance that is at once serious and simple; serious as far as the implication of the penance is concerned, and simple as far as the practicability is concerned.[21]

In the affair of sagotra marriage, Hemādri would permit the male person, as well as the issue of the sagotra union, to enter the society with the penance described above. But what about the woman sinner? The marriage between sagotra persons is declared void by all legislators. Hemādri prescribed for the wife one half of the penance that the male is asked to perform. He, however, does not define what is exactly meant by one half of the penance, to be performed by the male sinner. The next point that he has not cleared is, "Can the woman, so released from sin, marry again?" The question must bear a different aspect, when the union has resulted in an issue; but where simply marriage has taken place, and where no further developments have followed, the girl-wife must logically be declared a virgin, if the original marriage is to be considered null and void. This

21 Hemādri, IV. pp. 365-366.

question has been picked up in right earnest by two later writers, Mitramiśra, the author of Vīramitrodaya and Ananta Bhaṭṭa, the author of Vidhāna-Pārijāta, writers of the seventeenth and eighteenth century respectively.

Mādhava, the famous minister of the king of Vijayānagar, or rather one who established the Hindu Rāj of the Carnatic, wrote his commentary on the Parāśara-Smṛiti in the latter half of the fourteenth century. He was the brother of Sāyanāchārya, the renowned Bhāshya-writer. Mādhava seems from his work a scholar of the first order. In his learned way of explaining a subject, he surpasses all other commentators, ancient or modern. Vijñāneśvara attained a high degree of popularity no doubt, but, compared to Mādhava in point of scholarship, Vijñāneśvara cuts a poor figure. From Mādhava's commentary, we may see that he had gone through every piece of literature, Vedic or Purāṇic that was available in his time. Mādhava's position is peculiar from one more point of view. He was not only a legislator, but being the chief administrator of a great Hindu Rāj, he had to put into execution the law that he preached. One might say, like the Napoleonic Code, Parāśara-Mādhava is a unique work on Hindu law, the two roles of legislator and administrator being combined in one person in both the cases. As a matter of fact, Mādhava by his commentary has immortalized Parāśara's work.

Parāśara does not explain in his Smṛiti the duties to be performed in the four Āśramas—stages of life; and so, we do not find anything written by him on the rule of sept exogamy But Mādhava does not allow the matter to rest there. He explains that Parāśara is silent on the point, because he was not questioned on that point by his son Vyāsa. Mādhava, therefore, himself initiates

the discussion about the duties of the four Āśramas. He gives the rule of sept exogamy in the terms of Manu and Yājñavalkya; while, as to the avoidance of the mother's gotra, his argument is on the line of Devaṇa Bhaṭṭa. Mādhava is ready to construe Manu's verse (III-5) in such a way as will exclude also the mother's gotra. But this exclusion is merely nominal, because in the Brāhma form of marriage the wife loses her father's gotra and joins her husband's gotra, as soon as the Sapta-padī —the ceremony of walking seven steps hand in hand by the bride and the bridegroom is over. Mādhava quotes Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa to establish that the gotra of the bride's father survives the Sapta-padī only in the Gāndharva form of marriage. Now, as is well known, in the Hindu society, at least in the first three castes, Brāhma form of marriage is the most popular form, and the Gāndharva form is the least resorted to. Thus, the rule of the exclusion of mother's gotra is to be operative in scarce cases. Like Devaṇa Bhaṭṭa, Mādhava is an advocate of marriage with the maternal uncle's daughter, and hence his determined attitude on the question of the mother's gotra. At present, Brahmins of the Mādhyandina branch only avoid the mother's gotra in marriage, but they do not avoid it on the theory of Mādhava. They, of course, marry according to the Brāhma form of marriage, and still they avoid the mother's gotra. It is a usual custom of commentators and Nibandha-writers that they will not directly condemn a rule given by the ancients—even when they disagree with it. They will either accept the rule with such provisions as will render the original text almost inoperative, or they will place the rule under Kalivarjya (things not to be performed in the Kali-age).

Although Parāśara does not give the rule of sept exogamy in his Āchārādhyāya, he deals with the breach of the rule of sept exogamy in his chapter on penances.

While commenting on Parāśara's verses (X-5-6), Mādhava, following Yama-Smṛiti, declares that there are three kinds of Chāṇḍālas—One is a person, born from a Sanyāsin who has broken his vow of celibacy; other is the son of a Brahmin mother and a Śūdra father; and the third is the son of a woman, wedded to a sagotra person. The Yama-Smṛiti that is printed in the Ānandāśrama series does not give the verse. Thus, Mādhava considers a person, born of the sagotra union, a Chāṇḍāla. But that is not evidently the view of Parāśara; because in the same chapter in the fourteenth verse he prescribes a separate penance for connection with a sagotra girl along with many other unapproachable women like the Guru's wife, daughter-in-law and so on. In his commentary on the above verse, Mādhava quotes Sumantu and Śātātapa who prescribe a Lunar penance for the sin of sagotra marriage. Then, he quotes Baudhāyana-Dharma-Sūtra in which, as we have seen already, no penance for sagotra marriage as such is prescribed, and only when a son is born, a Kṛichchhra penance of three months is to be performed. What is then the real view of Mādhava? Does he really think that the issue from a sagotra union is a Chāṇḍāla, because the woman so married is a Chāṇḍālī? Or, does he agree with the mild view of Sumantu and Śātātapa and finally the milder view of Baudhāyana? The question is very difficult to answer. There is one thing, however, that we may not lose sight of. In Mādhava we get an administrator and a legislator combined. He could not merely idealise. As the prime minister of a great Hindu state, he had to deal practically with law. So, we may expect that in his work he must have ever kept before him the practical side of any law that he explained. When he includes a woman married to a sagotra person in the list of Chāṇḍālīs, he simply states the idealistic view, held by most of the writers of his time;

but that it was not his own view may be seen from his comments on the fourteenth verse in the same chapter, actually dealing with sagotra marriage. If he really thought that a woman married to a sagotra person was a Chāṇḍālī and her son a Chāṇḍāla, he would have once more quoted Yama, or he would have quoted the verse which Smṛiti-Chandrikā had attributed to Āpastamba. Instead of doing so, Mādhava quotes three authorities, all of whom prescribe a mild penance for a sagotra marriage, and even for the birth of a child. In the Baudhāyana-Sūtra which Mādhava quotes for the birth of a son from a sagotra connection, three months' Kṛichchhra penance was thought sufficient. Though Baudhāyana does not make it clear, this three months' Kṛichchhra penance, in all probability, purified all the three sinners—the father, the mother and the child. It will be a legitimate inference, therefore, on the whole that, though Mādhava mentions the idealistic view that the issue of a sagotra union is to be regarded a Chāṇḍāla, for all practical purposes the Chāṇḍālaship was to be considered a technical one; and Mādhava was of opinion that some sort of penance, the Lunar or the Kṛichchhra, would be sufficient for the purification of the sinners.

Madana-Pārijāta is the Nibandha-work of Viśveśvara, written in the fifteenth century in the vicinity of Delhi. On the subject of sagotra marriage he quotes Bṛihad-Yama who lays down that connection with a sagotra woman is equivalent to connection with Guru's wife or the mother. Like Vijñāneśvara he quotes a Smṛiti which he does not name to the effect that a woman, married to a sagotra husband, is a Vṛishalī; and Vṛishalī means a Chāṇḍālī[22]. Briefly speaking, sagotra marriage has been discussed in Madana-Pārijāta on the same lines

22 Madana-Pārijāta, pp. 133—138.

as that of Mitāksharā. As to the avoidance of the mother's gotra, Viśveśvara opines that local custom should be observed in the matter.

Nirṇaya-Sindhu, Vīramitrodaya and Saṁskāra-Kaustubha are the Nibandha–works of the seventeenth century. Among them Nirṇaya-Sindhu is the earliest. It was composed by Kamalākara, a Deccani Pandit, at Benares. Among recent works, Nirṇaya-Sindhu is regarded with great respect throughout India. Kamalākara, after declaring that the sameness of the gotra and the sameness of the pravara separately prohibit marriage, proceeds to tell as to what should be done when there is complete ignorance of the gotra and pravara of a person. He quotes Satyāshāḍha who says that "the pravaras of the family priest or the initiating priest should be borrowed." One writer lays down that, in such cases, the person ignorant of his gotra should make himself over to another person and should accept his gotra, or he should declare himself as belonging to the Jamadagni gotra. Divodāsīya also supports the view. In the old Sūtras provision is made regarding the course to be followed by a person ignorant of his pravara[23]. But in later works, either commentaries or Nibandhas, this question has not been treated. Kamalākara finds it necessary to provide for the contingency. The reason is obvious. Kamalākara wrote his work in 1612. Since several hundred years previous to it, India was being overrun by the Mohammedans, and Brahmanism was receiving rude shocks at their hands; and the Brahmins, as the spiritual leaders of the Hindus, were persecuted all over the country. In such troublesome times it was but quite natural that many Brahmins should forget their pravaras and gotras. This means that many Brahmins could not get

23 P. Chentsalrao, p. 318.

themselves even properly initiated. There was a time when the forgetting of the Vedas, once learned, was considered a serious sin. But times had changed; and it now became a doubtful matter whether every Brahmin properly remembered his gotra and pravara. We need not be surprised at all, if some Brahmins in the days of Kamalākara had forgotten their pravaras, and specially so in Northern India where the persecution of Brahmanism was carried on with greater vehemence by the Mohammedans. I am told by my Gujarāti Brahmin friends that Gujarāti Brahmins generally do not know their pravaras. From the information that I received from Benares it seems that the Brahmin community in Northern India as a whole is fairly on its way to forget pravaras.

Kamalākara, in prescribing expiatory penance for sagotra marriage, quotes Smṛityarthasāra which declares that intentional sagotra marriage is nothing short of the sin of Gurutalpa-violation of the Guru's bed; and the penance for such unlawful marriage is the same as that of Gurutalpa. The issue of the union should be considered a Chāṇḍāla. If the marriage takes place through ignorance, and if a son is also born, a Lunar penance will purify the sinner, and the son will belong to Kaśyapa gotra[24]. Which is an intentional sagotra marriage and which is an unintentional one is really very difficult to determine. In the seventeenth century the rule of sept exogamy had been so firmly established and was so much deep-rooted in the minds of the people that an intentional sagotra marriage was hardly a possibility. Whenever through ignorance such a marriage took place, Kamalākara prescribed three Lunar penances for the couple, and possibly no penance for the issue who was to join the Kaśyapa gotra.

24 Nirṇayasindhu, p. 332.

Nirṇaya-Sindhu, unlike the old Nibandha-writers and commentators, insists that the mother's gotra should be avoided in marriage. The popular view of the time was that, as laid down by Satyāshāḍha, mother's gotra should be avoided by only the Mādhyandina Brahmins. But Kamalākara points out that Satyāshāḍha never said so as is declared by the writer of Pravara-Mañjarī; and so, all should avoid the mother's gotra in marriage; otherwise they will be guilty of high sin.[25] It was an impossibility, however, to revive the principle of avoiding the mother's gotra in marriage, as it had long since fallen into general disfavour and disuse. It was now something like trying to revive a thing that was dead. Great authorities like Mādhava and Devaṇa had already spoken against its general application; and it was beyond hope that the principle would be acceptable to the general public. As mentioned before, only the Mādhyandina Brahmins excluded and even now exclude the mother's gotra in marriage.

In Vīramitrodaya the verse,

Ārūḍhapatitāpatyam Brāhmaṇyām yastu Śūdrajaḥ ।
Sagotroḍhāsutaḥ chaiva Chāṇḍālāh traya īritāḥ ॥

has been attributed to Baudhāyana. The same verse was attributed to Yama by Mādhava. It seems that this verse as well as the verse,

Samānagotrapravarām kanyām ūḍhvā upagamya cha ।
Tasyām utpādya Chāṇḍālam Brāhmaṇyāt eva hīyate ॥

which is attributed to Āpastamba, seem to be stock verses, whoever might be their real author. Whenever one is ignorant of his gotra, according to Mitramiśra, the author of Vīramitrodaya, the gotra of the spiritual teacher is to be assumed; and, when the spiritual teacher's gotra is not known, one should declare himself as belonging to Jamadagni or Kaśyapa gotra. When mar-

25 Nirṇayasindhu, p. 331.

riage between sagotra persons takes place unintentionally, and also a child is born, Vīramitrodaya would follow Baudhāyana-Sūtra and recommend that the child is not rendered impure at all, and the father would be purified by three Lunar penances. But, when the marriage is intentional, the penance declared by Yama and Trikāṇḍa Maṇḍana should be observed. The child should be declared a Chāṇḍāla, and the penance for Gurutalpa should be performed. Vīramitrodaya does not make it clear whether a Chāṇḍāla, born of a wilful sagotra marriage, can be afterwards purified by any expiation; but, in all probability, the Chāṇḍālaship was in name only, and could be removed by the mock burning of the child, prescribed by Hemādri, or by some other expiation.

From among the Nibandha-writers and commentators that I have noticed so far, nobody has considered the question of the fate of the girl who is married to a sagotra person, intentionally or unintentionally, and who is subsequently abandoned by the husband. The male party is purified, according to different authorities, by the performance of either one, two or three Lunar penances or Kṛichchhra penances. The issue from the union may not be impure at all, or he may be purified by some penance or other. But what about the woman who is a meek sufferer in the whole drama? The question was not possibly raised, because the Hindu woman is noted for her spirit of resignation. So, once the marriage was rendered invalid, there is little probability that a Hindu woman would be ready for a second marriage. Not that her temperament was so meek and resigned by nature; but the uniform treatment, offered to the woman class by the Indian Legislators, was calculated not to elevate and enliven her spirit; but on the contrary, it tended to create a sordid sense of submission and despondency. Under such circumstances, it was but

natural that commentators and Nibandha-writers did not discuss the question of the woman, married to a sagotra person and subsequently renounced. Vīramitrodaya opens the discussion with a quotation from Kātyāyana who lays down that a woman, although married once, should be bestowed upon another man, after being well dressed and well ornamented. In Brahmapurāṇa, remarriage of a woman once married is prohibited, it being placed in the list of 'Kalivarjya.' Mitramiśra, however, argues that the quotation from Brahmapurāṇa prohibits in Kali-age the remarriage of women in the following cases:—When the husband is dead, when the husband has turned a recluse, and when the husband is impotent or an outcast. But, in the case of sagotra marriage, marriage has not really taken place; so the dictum of the Brahmapurāṇa is not applicable to the present case; and a woman, married to a sagotra person and subsequently renounced, can have the option of marrying again. No writer up to this time had debarred the woman from marrying, and at the same time we must remember that none but Mitramiśra had yet given a positive lead on the point by declaring that the woman can exercise her option in the matter.

Mitramiśra, on the authority of Satyāshāḍha, confines the avoidance of the mother's gotra, only to the Mādhyandina Brahmins. With them also, the author proceeds, the gotra of the mother's father should be avoided; but the pravaras need not be taken into consideration.[26]

Anantadeva, the author of Saṁskāra–Kaustubha, does not discuss the rule of sept exogamy in detail. He prescribes penances for the younger brother and sister that anticipate their elders in marriage. But he

26 Vīramitrodaya, Vol. I. pp. 680—684.

does not prescribe any penance for a sagotra marriage. The only inference that we may draw from this is that sagotra marriages were very rare in the seventeenth century when Anantadeva wrote his work. The rule of gotra exogamy was universally accepted and followed. For all practical purposes there was hardly any breach of the rule; and hence, Anantadeva did not prescribe any penance for sagotra marriage. As far as Mahārāshṭra is concerned, even now, sagotra marriages are very rare. The writer of this work chanced to learn one isolated case of sagotra marriage during the last twenty-five years.[27] There is no doubt about the fact that sagotra marriages were, and even now, are very rare. Saṁskāra-Kaustubha, following Parāśara-Mādhava, lays down that the mother's gotra should be avoided by the Mādhyandina Brahmins only. It may be further avoided by all those whose mother was married according to Gāndharva form or was offered in marriage as a Putrikā by her father.[28]

Vidhāna-Pārijāta is a very recent work, written by Ananta Bhaṭṭa, in the year 1760. In prescribing penances for sagotra marriage, the author first quotes Prayoga-Pārijāta that prescribes the Gurutalpa penance for a wilful sagotra marriage. When the marriage is unintentional, Tapta-Kṛichchhra penance is to be performed, and the issues are to belong to Bharadvāja gotra and not to Kaśyapa gotra as told by Baudhāyana. When mere marriage has taken place, a Kṛichchhra penance may be made. Vidhāna-Pārijāta then quotes Shaṭtri-

27 Since this sentence was written, a sagotra marriage in the Mahārāshṭra Brahmin community was celebrated at Gwalior. Owing to the very high social status of the bride and the bridegroom, effective excommunication of the couple was out of the question; but the poor priest who officiated at the function is reported to have been placed under social boycott for some time and compelled to perform some suitable penance for being re-admitted in the society.

28 S. Kaustubha, pp. 692, 693.

ṁśanmata in which very mild penances are prescribed for the sin, and practical ways are suggested to meet the situation created by sagotra marriage. When the sagotra union has taken place due to ignorance, the couple may perform a Lunar penance. If the sagotra persons marry intentionally, two Lunar penances should be performed. The father of the girl should perform a Kṛichchhra or a double Kṛichchhra penance in these cases. The father, after performing the penance, should give over the girl to a Brahmin of Bharadvāja gotra or Kaśyapa gotra. With proper rituals, the girl should be asked to sit in a tub of ghee. Thus she is purified, and then she should be given to another husband. One who marries her in this way does not incur any sin. Doing it in any other way, he is condemned to hell. Here, the question of the remarriage of a girl, married to a sagotra person, has been treated in a matter of fact way. Vidhāna-Pārijāta adds that such remarriages of women, married to sagotra males, should be celebrated in any month of the year. Āśvalāyana's Sūtra 'Sārvakālikam eke vivāham' should apply to these cases.[29]

Dharma-Sindhu is the work of a Mahārāshṭra Pandit named Kāśīnātha. It was finished at Paṇḍharpur in 1790. Though a recent work, its popularity is great. Kāśīnātha's style is very lucid and his exposition of the subject-matter is very clear. He prescribed a mild penance for a sagotra marriage. When the action is unintentional, one Lunar penance, and when the action is wilful, two Lunar penances should be performed. The girl should perform one half of the penances. This is the view that Kāśīnātha supports. He then mentions different views held by different writers. "A son, born of a wilful sagotra marriage should be considered a Chāṇḍāla, because

29 Vidhāna-Pārijāta, pp. 707—709.

Yama-Smṛiti says so." It seems that Yama's view was not approved of by the author; because he states his mild penance first, while Yama's view is quoted last; and though the writer does not condemn Yama's view, at the same time he does not speak one approving word about that view. Dharma-Sindhu is emphatic in declaring that the mother's gotra should be avoided only by the Mādhyandina Brahmins and not by others.[30]

Recapitulation

History of sept exogamy has been now briefly told from the days of Manu down to the eighteenth century of the Christian era. It will be convenient to recapitulate it, before we proceed to consider sapiṇḍa exogamy. To determine the exact period in which sept exogamy was first introduced among the Indo-Aryans is next to impossible. I have tried to show that in early Vedic times sept exogamy must have been absent, though marriage was generally contracted outside the family. In the days of the Saṁhitās other than the Ṛigveda and the Brāhmaṇa works, gotras had made their appearance and the Brahmin community was being organized on the basis of pravaras; and most probably, by this time gotra had begun to be considered in selecting a bride, though a hard and fast rule may not yet have been laid down. I have further shown that Manu is the oldest law-giver in India, and even the Taittirīya Saṁhitā has recognised the high authority of Manu. The metrical Manu-Smṛiti that has come down to us may be a recent work; but it undoubtedly retains a large portion of the traditional law. The rule of sept exogamy, as given in Manu-Smṛiti, is rather loose and no penalty is provided for the breach of that rule. In Manu's rule of exogamy, pravara is not mentioned; nor it is implied,

30 Dharmasindhu, pp. 143—144.

although commentators, writing their works several hundred years after Manu, have interpreted his word 'sagotra' as 'sapravara'. As sept exogamy must have begun with gotra, pure and simple, meaning a surname, for reasons that have been already explained fully, we may say that the earliest form of sept exogamy is to be found in Manu's work. As no penance is prescribed for the breach of the rule, it may be considered to be rather a recommendatory rule than a compulsory one.

Turning to the Sūtra works, we find that the meaning of the word 'gotra' has been now widened. The word 'sagotra,' used by Baudhāyana, is to be understood in the sense of 'samāna-pravara'. Thus, with the Sūtra-writers, the scope of the rule is extended and some penances are prescribed for the sin of sagotra marriage. Baudhāyana in his Dharma-Sūtra declares that a sagotra wife should be abandoned as far as sexual life is concerned, but should be protected like the mother. When the sagotra marriage results in an issue, the issue would belong to Kaśyapa gotra, and the father would be purified by a Kṛichchhra penance of three months. Gautama speaks very strongly against sagotra marriage; but his views on this point are extreme and may not be seriously considered. Generally speaking, the view of the Sūtra-writers on the question of sagotra marriage is rather lenient. For the mere act of sagotra marriage Baudhāyana would prescribe no penance beyond abandoning the sagotra wife.

After the beginning of the Christian era, sept exogamy grows more and more rigid. A sagotra marriage is placed on a par with the sin of the violation of Guru's bed. Nārada prescribes the excision of the organ, as the only adequate punishment for union with a sagotra woman. However, neither in Yājñavalkya nor in Nārada, Bṛihaspati or Parāśara Smṛitis, we find any de-

nunciation of a son, born of the sagotra marriage, as a Chāṇḍāla. In the Smṛitis, attributed to Yama, Bṛihad-Yama, Vyāsa etc., sagotra marriage is condemned in strong terms, and the issue is declared a Chāṇḍāla. But all these Smṛitis are either non-existent or are found only in fragments. But, as commentators and Nibandha-writers have quoted Yama, Bṛihad-Yama, Vyāsa, Āpastamba and Baudhāyana (the last two names are not to be identified with the ancient Sūtra-writers) to denounce the sagotra marriage as highly sinful and to declare the progeny as Chāṇḍāla, these Smṛitis must have been written before the age of the commentators began i.e. before the ninth century.

Medhātithi, the first great commentator on Manu, observes that, though the person who marries a sagotra woman unknowingly and then abandons her commits no sin, he should perform the penance as it has been ordained by writers other than Manu. Later commentators like Aparārka and Vijñāneśvara considered sagotra marriage quite a censurable thing. They would further style the woman, married to a sagotra husband as a Chāṇḍālī, and her son is, of course, to be considered a Chāṇḍāla. Somewhat lighter penance is prescribed for unintentional sagotra marriage; while a continuous and wilful connection with a sagotra woman can hardly be expiated by a penance of twelve years. The two commentators differentiate between the mere act of sagotra marriage and its consummation either by sexual union or by the birth of an issue.

From the very harsh penances that are prescribed by the commentators and Nibandha-writers for sagotra marriage, the only reasonable inference that we may draw is that sagotra marriage had now become almost extinct and marriage outside the gotra had become the

uniform law. And thus, the penances prescribed were more or less nominal as occasions for these penances did not generally arise. For wilful sagotra marriage a sterner penance is prescribed. But how are we to determine that a particular sagotra marriage is a wilful act? As the rule had been now universally accepted and practised, cases of wilful sagotra marriage must have been very rare. In the same way it seems that the Chāṇḍālaship of the issue, born of the sagotra union, was a nominal one. Thus, Hemādri prescribed the penance of mock burning in the fire of cow-dung for the issue of sagotra marriage. The man who married a sagotra woman is to be re-initiated and the woman is to perform half the penance done by the man. That the Chāṇḍālaship, attributed to the issue of a sagotra union, was a technical one and it could be removed by suitable penances may be further seen from the fact that the verse that declares the issue of a sagotra union a Chāṇḍāla places under the same category the children of a Sanyāsin-an ascetic-who has broken his vow of celibacy and re-entered the life of a householder. I may recall here the historical example of Jñāneśvara, his two brothers and one sister all of whom were born after their father had renounced his Sanyāsa. At Āḷandī they were placed under social boycott; but the way of purification was kept open to them, and they were directed to proceed to Paiṭhan, a seat of great learning in the thirteenth century; and we are told that they were declared finally pure by the Paiṭhan Pandits. What I mean to point out is that the Chāṇḍālaship was such as could be removed by the performance of rites. Hemādri makes it possible for all the sinning parties in a sagotra marriage to be purified by the performance of practicable penances. Writers after Hemādri have generally prescribed rather easy penances for sagotra marriage. Thus, Mādhava,

although he states the sterner verdicts of Yama and Bṛihad-Yama, finally recommends that the mild penance prescribed in the Baudhāyana-Dharma-Sūtra, should be performed. Vīramitrodaya goes a step forward and suggests that a woman, married to a sagotra person, after the dissolution of the first marriage,—as a matter of fact, there was no marriage at all—should be allowed to remarry. Vidhāna-Pārijāta. a work of the eighteenth century, gives the full procedure of the remarriage of a woman who has been married to a sagotra person, and is subsequently abandoned. She is to be offered to a Brahmin of Kaśyapa or Jamadagni gotra, and then she should be married according to the regular practice. Dharma-Sindhu which was written at the close of the eighteenth century prescribes mild penances, for an unintentional as well as intentional sagotra marriage.

Some legislators may have prescribed stern penances for sagotra marriage, others might have recommended mild penances; but one fact stands prominently before our eyes, namely, beginning from the Sūtra times down to the days of Dharm-Sindhu, all writers on Hindu law have uniformly disapproved of sagotra marriage or rather sagotra marriage is to be considered not to have taken place altogether. All writers agree on the point that, as soon as the sagotra marriage is detected, the wife is to be abandoned. Severity or mildness of the penance is a matter of secondary importance. The individual temperament of the legislator is often responsible for the severity or otherwise of the penance prescribed. I should like to suggest one more explanation. In Sūtra times the rule of sept exogamy had not been universally accepted; and so, the penances for its breach were lenient. During the period beginning with the Christian era and ending with the twelfth or thirteenth century, the rule was deeply impressed on the minds

of the people by the law-givers. To secure the universal observance of the rule, the law-givers denounced sagotra marriage in no measured terms, and prescribed very severe penances for the act. By declaring that the issue of a sagotra union should be considered a Chāṇḍāla, the legislators were able to completely wipe off sagotra unions from the Hindu society. The Chāṇḍālaship, attributed to the issue from a sagotra marriage, must have proved a very effective catch-word, in the mouths of the law-givers owing to the previous associations of the term Chāṇḍāla. During this period the rule got such a hold on the minds of the people that it began to be considered almost a law of nature. After the thirteenth century the rule was so firmly established in the society that its breach became a very rare thing; and consequently legislators after the thirteenth century prescribed rather lenient penances for sagotra marriage.

CHAPTER VIII

Origin of the Brahmin Sept Exogamy

Last two chapters cover the history of sept exogamy of the Indo-Aryans and specially of the Brahmins from the Sūtra period down to our own times. Before proceeding to examine the rules of sapiṇḍa exogamy, it is necessary to consider how and why the Indo-Aryans introduced sept exogamy among them—exogamy, which we know, they did not practise in the Indo-Iranian times as well as in the early Vedic times in India. It must be answered whether the sept exogamy, as far as the Indo-Aryans were concerned, was a natural development of their culture, or they introduced it in imitation of some other people. To answer this question we must look into the most important of the various probable explanations of the origin of exogamy that have been put forth by different scholars.

Different Theories regarding the Origin of Exogamy

McLennan, who is to be credited with the first introduction of the word 'exogamy' in the English language, is of opinion that exogamy is to be traced back to the practice of marriage by capture relics of which are still observable in many races. Thus, a mock capture of the bride and a feigned resistance by her relatives precede the actual marriage ceremony in certain tribes. In the early savage stages of humanity man lived on hunting; and female children who could not help the hunting pursuits of the father were neglected and often killed. The shortage of girls that was so caused in the society led to the inevitable result that men had to compete hard for getting a wife and had to resort to forcible measures. The practice of securing a wife by capture must have, in

course of time, led to the uniform rule of exogamy[1]. Dr. Westermarck finds fault with this explanation. He thinks that McLennan exaggerates both the prevalence of female infanticide and the prevalence of marriage by capture in the primitive world[2]. Besides, female infanticide and the subsequent scarcity of girls may lead to polyandry and not to exogamy. Whatever it may be, the explanation may be applicable only to the exogamy prevalent among savage or half-savage races. Indo-Aryans were a cultured people. There is no substantial evidence to prove that they practised universal female infanticide. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa we are told that "wife is a friend, daughter a calamity, and the son is the highest light.[3]" But this is an isolated reference, and it does not follow from it that the Indo-Aryans killed their female children. The conception of family is fully developed in the Ṛigveda literature. Woman is highly honoured and valued. "Wife is the home, she alone is the place of rest."[4] In Vedic times the shortage of girls was never felt as we may see from the example of Ghoshā who grew old in her father's house pining for a husband[5]. When there is no scarcity of girls, the necessity of marriage by capture does not arise. Love-making by girls in the Ṛigveda times which has been previously referred to does not leave room for the theory of marriage by capture.

Among the eight forms of marriage, the Rākshasa form did allow the capture of the bride by force; but this form of marriage was restricted only to the Ksha-

1 " Studies in Ancient History," (1886), pp. 70, 75, 76.
2 Westermarck, Vol. II. p. 165.
3 A. Brāhmaṇa, 7—13.
4 Ṛig. III—53—4.
5 Ṛig. I—117—7.

triyas, [6] and looking to the whole range of the Purāṇic literature we find that even among the Kshatriyas examples of marriage by capture were very few. It seems, therefore, that, although the Kshatriyas were allowed to have marriage by capture, they generally followed the Brahmanical forms of marriage. And, if the Kshatriyas ever followed the Rākshasa form of marriage, they did so, not because there was any scarcity of girls; but, because such a form of marriage suited their warlike taste. The Kshatriyas preferred death in battle to death on sick-bed. If death was not possible on a battle-field, instead of dying a natural death they sometimes ended their life by violent means. Such was the peculiar temperament of the Indian Kshatriyas; and so, some of them preferred the Rākshasa form of marriage to the other peaceful forms, and in those cases only where the prize of the capture was a renowned beauty, sought for by more than one prince. Thus, it will be seen that McLennan's theory cannot explain the appearance of sept exogamy among the Indo-Aryans.

Spencer thinks that exogamy must have originated as the natural result of the inter-tribal war which incessantly prevailed in the primitive society. Woman might be an item of booty of the war and a captured woman might serve a double purpose of being a slavish wife and a trophy. One, possessed of such a trophy, may be honoured more by his neighbours; and thus, the practice of marrying a captive girl might, in course of time, develop into exogamy. [7] Spencer's theory, on the face of it, is less plausible than that of McLennan. As far as the Indo-Aryans were concerned, they were mainly engaged in warfare against the aboriginal tribes in India. Inter-

6 Manu. III—24.

7 "Principles of Sociology", 1. pp. 618—620.

tribal wars there may be, but they were few; and, above all, the Brahmins and the Vaiśyas generally never took any part in wars. And still the rule of exogamy; as applied to the Brahmins, was sterner and far more comprehensive than in the case of the Kshatriyas. There is not a shred of evidence in Sanskrit literature to prove that the principle of exogamy first originated with the Kshatriyas and then spread to other classes.

Lord Avebury bases his theory of exogamy on communal marriage which, he believes, all primitive societies uniformly practised. Due to the prevalence of communal marriage, all the women in the clan are the wives of all the men in the clan. If a woman is captured from another tribe, the law of communal marriage may not operate; and thus, a captured wife may be the exclusive possession of one individual.[8] Ingenious as the theory is, it really does not take us nearer to the explanation of the appearance of exogamy among the Indo-Aryans. In the Ṛigveda times and even in the Indo--Iranian days of Aryan civilization, marriage is looked upon as a sacred tie. The word denoting a couple is 'Dampatī' in the Ṛigveda, and it is always used in the dual showing the general prevalence of monogamy. In the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa we are told that one man may have many wives but a woman cannot have co-husbands.[9] The only pertinent reference to group-marriage that I could find is from Āpastamba: "For they declare that the bride is given to the family (of her husband) and not to the husband alone.[10] " The reference, however, is quite passingly made in connection with the Niyoga to prove the superior

8 "Origin of Civilization and the primitive condition of Man", p. 94.

9 A. Brāhmaṇa, 3—23; Haug, p. 197.

10 Āpa. Dha. II—27-3; S. B. E. Vol. II. p. 164.

claim of the gentiles against strangers. Besides, Āpastamba is not here enunciating any principle of morality or law. But he is, like a lawyer, simply defending the rights of the members of a family against strangers. What is stated incidentally must not be taken too seriously. In the famous dialogue between Paṇḍu and Kunti, Paṇḍu refers to a state of society, betraying very loose sexual morals.[11] The state of society, described by Paṇḍu, may be considered as belonging to the prehistoric period; and granting that Paṇḍu speaks of a period known to history, the state of things that he describes is not the state of communal marriage. What Paṇḍu means is that marriage ties in ancient times were very loose; but by loose ties Paṇḍu never meant communal marriage. Thus, Lord Avebury's thesis does not help us to explain the exogamy among the Aryan settlers in India.

Morgan tries to explain the origin of exogamy by the simple fact that people constantly watched the evil effects of marriage between very near relatives like brother and sister and slowly arrived at the conclusion that such marriages were harmful. Marriage of near kin was prohibited first; then followed by analogy the extensive law of clan or sept exogamy.[12] Morgan takes it for granted that bad consequences follow the mating of near kin. But from the researches of modern biologists the much-spoken-of evil results of inbreeding will be found rather imaginary than real. Due to peculiar combinations in few cases marriage of kin may lead to evil effects. But Morgan presumes a continuous observation of such uniform evil results which inclines the people to prohibit marriage between near relatives and finally to prohibit marriage in the clan. Modern biologists have proved

11 Mabh. I. Chapters 127—128.

12 Morgan, pp. 424—425.

that, though uniformly healthy results cannot be guaranteed from inbreeding, one thing is beyond doubt clear that evil consequences of inbreeding are always exaggerated. Besides, granting that Morgan's presumption that people continuously observed the evil effects of inbreeding, it can explain the exogamy among the primitive tribes. The Indo-Aryans, when they entered the plains of the Indus, were no longer a primitive people. In comparison to the native tribes that surrounded them, they were far civilized. They had a long history behind them. If exogamy is to be explained by Morgan's theory, the Indo-Aryans and even the Iranians ought to have adopted exogamy long since. For a long time the Aryans must have been watching the alleged evil consequences of kin marriage; and as a result, sept exogamy ought to have been found fully established among the Iranians and the Indo-Aryans. But instead of adopting sept exogamy the Iranians effected marriages between parallel cousins.

Sir J. G. Frazer who closely follows Morgan tries to make out that the object of exogamy was to prevent the marriage between near kin, and especially the marriage between brother and sister, mother and her son.[13] As a motive for preventing the union of near kin, Sir James suggests that many primitive peoples believe that "the effect of incest and of sexual crime in general is to make woman barren and to prevent animals and plants from multiplying."[14] He further argues that, according to the latest authorities, inbreeding in the long run hampers fertility; and thus, the common belief among many primitive peoples that incest leads to barrenness is quite natural and justifiable[15]. As my present pur-

13 Frazer, Vol. IV. pp. 112, 113, 136.
14 Frazer, Vol. IV. p. 157.
15 Frazer, Vol. IV. p. 162.

pose is not to deal with general theory of exogamy, I do not propose to discuss the merits of Sir J. G. Frazer's argument at any length. Barrenness is not a necessary result of inbreeding. Even according to Frazer, fertility is not adversely affected until inbreeding is continued for several generations; and the practical difficulty in accepting Frazer's theory is, whether the savage peoples can be reasonably expected to take a simultaneous and unimpassioned review of events, spreading over several generations, and finally to come to the conclusion that the inbreeding, practised by them and their comparative sterility are inter-related as cause and effect. To connect inbreeding and sterility as cause and effect is certainly a difficult task even for the civilized man; while to comprehend the relation of cause and effect between sexual union and conception is comparatively easy. But we are told that the natives of Central Australia, even now, explicitly deny that the children are the fruit of the commerce of sexes.[16]

In the case of the Indo-Aryans, in the whole Sanskrit literature, ancient and modern, wherever inbreeding is condemned, it is condemned on religious grounds and not on eugenical grounds. In Sanskrit works on medicine and physiology several rules of eugenics are given, but the subject of inbreeding and outbreeding is not even mentioned. One more fact I should like to add. Not only the Indo-Aryan but the whole Aryan race also, which, as we have seen, did not practise sept exogamy, does not seem to have suffered from sterility. On the contrary, a race that, within a comparatively short period, spread triumphantly over distant parts of the world, may safely be presumed to be rather a fast multiplying race.

16 Frazer, Vol. I. pp. 189—191.

Prof. Durkheim maintains that the ultimate source of exogamy is totemism; but, as has been abundantly shown by Frazer, the two institutions are quite independent of each other and one can exist without the other.[17] Besides, in explaining the exogamy of the Indo-Aryans the theory of Prof. Durkheim will not be any way useful to us; because the Indo-Aryans were entirely free from totemic beliefs, at least in the Ṛigveda and Brāhmaṇa times.

Dr. Westermarck, after criticising the theories of other scholars, sets down his own theory regarding the origin of exogamy as follows: "Generally speaking there is a remarkable absence of erotic feeling between persons living very closely together from childhood Nay more, in this, as in many other cases, sexual indifference is combined with the positive feeling of aversion when the act is thought of. This I take to be the fundamental cause of the exogamous prohibitions. Persons who have been living together closely from childhood are as a rule near relatives. Hence their aversion to sexual relations with one another displays itself in custom and law as a prohibition of intercourse between near kin."[18] Westermarck thus tries to explain the origin of exogamy by a psychological instinct in the human mind on account of which a man feels definite aversion to sexual union with those who are his constant companions from childhood. Evidently Dr. Westermarck, in presuming the existence of such an instinct in human mind, is presuming too much. Erotic sentiment is the most powerful sentiment in the primitive man. According to modern psychologists, "the simple sexual instinct is normally aroused to some extent between all or nearly all individuals of opposite sexes. The different nature

17 Frazer, Vol. IV. p. 108.

18 Westermarck, Vol. II. pp. 192, 193.

of the emotional relation between a mother and her son, and between a father and his daughter, on the one hand, and between a father and his son and a mother and her daughter, on the other, is generally admitted, and it can only be due to the difference of sex."[19] Besides, we cannot ignore the fact that the feeling of aversion for sexual union between very near relatives is felt in the twentieth century, when the law of exogamy has been in force for some thousand years. As regards the primitive sentiment on this problem, we have no positive evidence; but the impassioned overtures of Yamī to Yama, her brother, for sexual union, so graphically described in the Ṛigveda,[20] certainly do not speak in favour of the theory of Dr. Westermarck. What Dr. Westermarck thinks the cause of exogamy is, as a matter of fact, the result of exogamy. Yama, no doubt, discards the overtures of his sister; but he does so, not because he feels a natural aversion for being sexually connected with his sister, but because he is afraid that his actions may be watched by the spies of gods who are ever awake. I have already quoted in the first chapter a passage from the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, where a brother and a sister are holding out fervent hopes that they may be united in the third generation or the fourth generation.[21] Whatever may be the origin of exogamy of the primitive peoples, the introduction of sept exogamy in the Indo-Aryan society cannot be explained by Dr. Westermarck's theory.

The Indo-Aryans must have adopted Sept Exogamy in Imitation of the Aboriginal Races

How are we then to account for the appearance of sept exogamy among the Aryan settlers in India?

19 A. G. Tansley, "The New Psychology," (1923), p. 270.
20 Ṛig. X—10.
21 Supra, p. 18.

Neither was it a legacy that they brought from their Indo-Iranian home, nor can its origin be satisfactorily explained by the various theories of exogamy so far propounded by scholars. The only possible explanation that may be offered is that the Indo-Aryans copied the custom of sept exogamy from the aborigines. Most of the non-Aryan tribes were totemic and almost all were exogamous. The Indo-Aryans were, no doubt, the conquerors of India and better civilized than the natives of India. But the numerical strength of the conquerors was poor. It could not be otherwise. The mountain passes through which they came presented difficulties of no ordinary type. Even on arriving in India the Indo-Aryans had to make stiff fight and had to gain ground inch by inch. The native of India, be he a Muṇḍa, or a Draviḍa, was not a mean foe. He fought hard before he yielded. It was several hundred years before the conquering Aryans could reach the Vindhya mountain, the border line of the Deccan. Due to their limited numbers, the conquering Aryans were not able to secure a complete subjugation of the natives. It was more a moral conquest than a political one. The fury of the conquerors soon died away, and they saw the necessity of settling down and reconciling themselves to those of the aborigines who readily consented to their yoke. This reconcilation was gradual and, perhaps, imperceptibly slow; but in the given circumstances it was inevitable. When the victor and the vanquished were reconciled, there followed a free exchange of their respective cultures.

What were the particular items of social or religious life that the Indo-Aryans borrowed from the aborigines or taught them will be a suitable subject for an independent inquiry. Suffice to say that by the continuous

process of borrowing and lending some of the aboriginal tribes have been raised to the highest social status in the Hindu society; while the Brahmin, the vociferous exponent of the Indo-Aryan culture, has been brought to worship most devoutly the frightful deities of the Dravidas with the help of Vedic Mantras. In other words, the two rival societies after their reconcilation were completely transformed. The Aryans proved a peculiarly adaptive people. In spite of their small numbers, they overran the vast continent of India and, though they could not attain complete political supremacy at once, they did establish their moral supremacy from one corner of the country to the other. Willingly or unwillingly all aboriginal tribes had to submit to the moral yoke of the Brahmins. This was not and could not be a feat to be performed by one individual. Nor could it be finished in a few decades. By slow degrees the Indo-Aryan won, but won irrevocably.

To achieve this, it was, however, necessary that the aborigines or the non-Aryans should be thoroughly impressed that the Aryan conqueror was their superior in every respect, physically as well as morally; or rather, the recognition of the moral supremacy of the Aryans by the aborigines was a matter of greater importance than the recognition of the physical superiority. Once the moral supremacy of the invader was impressed on the minds of the vanquished, their complete subjugation was an easy affair. The Indo-Aryans in the long run, owing to their numerical weakness, had to depend more upon a moral conquest of the aborigines. As is quite well known, the aboriginal tribes of India, Draviḍa or Ādi-Draviḍa, were exogamous. In most of the non-Aryan tribes members of the same totem formed an exogamous group. The law of exogamy, as practised in some of the aboriginal tribes of the world till very recent times, pre-

scribed capital penalty for the infringement of the law.[22] At any rate, most primitive societies looked and even now look with the greatest abhorrence upon one who marries within the sept. Marriage within the sept is considered an offence, hardly less serious than the murder of a member of the sept. It was and it is the worst moral depravity of which an individual can be guilty. If the Indo-Aryan aspired to impress the non-Aryan with his moral supremacy, it was imperative that he must show to the non-Aryan that on the important social question of the selection of the bride the Indo-Aryan was at least as great a puritan as the non-Aryan, if not more rigid than he. The Indo-Aryan had already learnt to despise the consanguineous marriages which may have been common enough in his Indo-Iranian life. The principle of selecting a female outside the table of prohibited degrees was being accepted. We cannot exactly say up to what generation marriage was prohibited; but we may expect that once the reaction against consanguineous marriages had begun, it could not stop until a considerable progress was made in the opposite direction. As observed before, the Indo-Aryan possessed a marvellous adaptability. To flatter the tastes of the non-Aryans and to prove his social purity beyond any doubt, the new settler adopted the general law of exogamy, as it was universally practised by the vanquished tribes.

Against this theory an objection may be raised that the Indo-Aryan first settled down in the Punjab; and, if he copied the rule of exogamy from the non-Aryans most of whom had totemic exogamous septs, distinct remains of totemism ought to have been found in the Punjab. But what we actually find is contrary to our expectation. The indications of totemism in the Punjab are very faint and quite negligible. In the first place

22 Frazer, Vol. IV. p. 157.

the statement that totemic clans in the Punjab are negligible is not quite correct. They are few, no doubt, and the indications of totemism are comparatively less distinct; but certainly they cannot be ignored.One more fact that we must not fail to take into account, namely, the possibility that the Punjab non-Aryan tribes may have been exogamous without being totemic. Besides, if totemism is less distinct in the Punjab, there are sound reasons for this state of things. The totemic tribes of the Punjab are being constantly influenced by the Indo-Aryan culture for some thousand years. Some tribes may have left their primitive creed and received the new Aryan culture quite readily. Other tribes might have proved more conservative and more tenacious, and might have tried their utmost to cling to the native ideals and native customs of life. Some aborigines have so far identified themselves with the Brahmin culture that they now safely pass for high class Rajputs and some claim even Brahmanical gotras. If proofs of totemism are rather weak in the Punjab, that may be the result of the complete conversion of the aboriginal tribes. Another equally probable explanation would be that the non-Aryans retreated from the Punjab before the advance of the Indo-Aryans. Leaving aside the Punjab, if we enter the heart of the country from any side, evidence of totemism in non-Aryan tribes is plentiful. For the comparative less prevalence of totemism in the Punjab, one more explanation may be offered. The Punjab has been often occupied by foreign invaders like the Greeks, Śakas, Huns and finally the Mohammedans. Majority of the population in the Punjab is Muslim. These invasions by the foreigners and, especially, by the Mohammedans are responsible for driving away and throwing back the non-Aryan tribes, for the extirpation of some and the conversion of others.

I have tried so far to show that sept exogamy current among the Indo-Aryans is inexplicable by any of the theories of scholars, and it can be explained by the only possibility that the Indo-Aryans grew exogamous in imitation of the non-Aryan races who surrounded them. This will further explain to us why the rule of sept exogamy, as laid down by Manu, the first law-giver of the Indo-Aryans, is so loose and so elastic. Originally exogamy was not an Indo-Aryan creed. They were deliberately imitating the exogamy of the non-Aryans, and in its early days of inception the rule could not but be loose. The lead in such matters was, of course, taken by the Brahmins; but it must have been considerable time, before the whole Aryan community could be impressed with the idea that the violation of the rule of sept exogamy was a serious sin.

CHAPTER IX

Sapiṇḍa Exogamy in the Sūtra and Smṛiti Works

Two different interpretations of the word Sapiṇḍa

I have done with gotra exogamy and it is time to turn to sapiṇḍa exogamy. As already stated, exogamy among the Indo-Aryans has two aspects; one prohibits marriage in the gotra or sept, while the other prohibits marriage with relatives within certain generations, both from the father's and the mother's side. Sagotra and sapiṇḍa are not entirely exclusive terms. Thus, a certain number of sagotras are included in the list of sapiṇḍas. The word piṇḍa has two senses. It means body as well as the ball of rice offered to the dead. Commentators and Nibandha-writers have explained the word in two ways, taking their stand on either of these senses. Vijñāneśvara who accepts the first sense of the word so proceeds to define sapiṇḍa relationship. "Sapiṇḍa relationship arises between two persons through their being connected by particles of one body. Thus, the son stands in sapiṇḍa relationship to his father, because the particles of the father's body have entered the son's body. In the same way, a grandson stands in the sapiṇḍa relationship to his grandfather, because through the medium of the father the particles of the grandfather's body have entered the grandson's body. The son is a mother's sapiṇḍa, because the particles of the mother's body are present in the son's body. So also, a person is a *sapiṇḍa* of his maternal grandfather and grandmother, in as much as the particles of their body have entered the person's body through his mother. The nephew becomes the sapiṇḍa of the maternal uncles and aunts, because the particles of the body of the grandfather have entered his body, as well as their bodies. By the same analogy, sapiṇḍa relationship is established with uncles, aunts

and others. The husband and the wife are sapiṇḍas, because they together beget the one body of the son. Brothers' wives are sapiṇḍas to each other, because they produce the body of sons, severally with their husbands who have sprung up from one body. Sapiṇḍa relationship is, therefore, connection with one body, either immediate or through transmission by descent. It will be seen, however, that in this way, sapiṇḍa relationship may spread over any number of generations. Just to put a stop to it Yājñavalkya declares that sapiṇḍa relationship exists for seven generations on the father's side and five generations on the mother's side."[1]

Piṇḍa has another sense, namely, the rice ball to be offered to the dead. Mādhava accepts this sense of the word and explains the word 'sapiṇḍa' in the following way. The first generation is of the person who offers the rice ball. His immediate three ancestors are the receivers of the piṇḍa or rice ball. Thus, father, grandfather and great grandfather are the receivers of the rice ball. Three immediate ancestors of the great grandfather receive only the 'lepā of the piṇḍa' (that much portion of the piṇḍa as is washed down from the hand). Thus, sāpiṇḍya i.e. sapiṇḍa relationship extends over seven generations. Mādhava quotes Matsya-Purāṇa (18-29) and Mārkaṇḍeya-Purāṇa (31-3, 4, 5) in support of his interpretation of the word 'sāpiṇḍya'. The paternal uncle and paternal uncle's son are to be regarded sapiṇḍas, in as much as paternal uncle and paternal uncle's son offer the piṇḍa to the grandfather who becomes the common substratum of the piṇḍas. In the same way maternal uncle becomes the sapiṇḍa of his nephew, because both the nephew and the maternal uncle offer piṇḍa to

---

1 Mitāksharā, Book I. p. 94.

the maternal uncle's father. Sāpiṇḍya of other relations is to be explained by the same method.

Which of these two rival interpretations is correct? Modern writers are almost equally divided on this point. Thus, Vijñāneśvara, Vāchaspati, Śuddhiviveka and Śūlapāṇi support the former interpretation, while the second interpretation where piṇḍa means a rice ball is accepted by Smṛiti-Chandrikā, Jīmūtavāhana, Aparārka, Medhātithi, Mādhava etc.[2] If we go back to the ancient Sūtra-writers, we find that Vasishṭha,[3] Āpastamba[4] and Gautama[5] do not make it clear in which sense they use the word sapiṇḍa. Baudhāyana and Manu, however, interprete the word 'piṇḍa' in sapiṇḍa as the rice ball given to the dead. Thus, Baudhāyana divides the sapiṇḍas into two classes, the receivers of undivided oblations and the receivers of divided oblations, the latter being called Sakulyas.[6] Manu also declares that piṇḍa is to be offered only to three generations. In the matter of inheritance Manu recognises the sāpiṇḍya i.e. sapiṇḍa relationship up to three generations only.[7] The Sakulyas come next.

Thus, Manu means by the word 'sapiṇḍa' a person to whom a rice ball is offered. In another place, in connection with death impurities he lays down that sāpiṇḍya extends to seven generations.[8] Here also, piṇḍa means a ball in as much as persons beyond the seventh generation are called Samānodakas—people to whom the same water is offered, or persons to whom water is offered equally. It is well known that persons to whom neither

2 Nirṇayasindhu, pp. 308, 309
3 Vasishṭha. IV—17.
4 Āpa. Dha. II—14-2.
5 Gautama, XIV—13.
6 Bau. Dha. I—11-9, 10.
7 Manu. IX—186.
8 Manu. V—60

undivided nor divided oblation is given are offered mere water. As generations after the seventh are called Samānodakas, the first seven generations must be the receivers of undivided and divided rice ball. In the Taittirīya Saṁhitā the word 'piṇḍa' has been used in the sense of body.[9] But it proves nothing. Nobody denies that 'piṇḍa' has both the senses. The point to be settled is, in which sense the expression 'sapiṇḍa' should be understood. Manu and Baudhāyana use the word sapiṇḍa in the sense of receivers of rice ball. It will be seen from this that Vijñāneśvara's interpretation of the word sapiṇḍa is not supported by the tradition of the old law-givers To consider the problem from a practical point of view, both Vijñāneśvara and Mādhava, by the application of their different interpretations and methods of argument, arrive at the same result as far as the limit of this kind of relationship is concerned. Apart from the meaning of the word piṇḍa, both parties agree on the actual denotation of the word 'sapiṇḍa'. Five generations on the mother's side and seven on the father's side is the universally accepted meaning of the word 'sapiṇḍa.'

Manu's Rule of Sapiṇḍa Exogamy

In the earlier portion of this work I have shown that, although the Indo-Aryans avoided some generations of agnates in marriage in the Ṛigveda times, with the cognates marriage could be contracted in the third generation on the father's as well as the mother's side. In other words a man could marry his maternal uncle's daughter as well as his paternal aunt's daughter. The mating of the children of two sisters does not seem to have been forbidden. Coming down to Brāhmaṇa works, we do not find any clear mention of sept exogamy; but

9 T. Saṁhitā, 4-6-9-3

as far as circumstantial evidence goes, it seems that the rule of sept exogamy must have been preached and at least partially practised by the Indo-Aryans in Brāhmaṇa times. With sapiṇḍa exogamy, however, no perceptible progress was made. Thus, with the cognates marriage was still possible in the third or fourth generation. What is the significance of the permission to marry in the third generation? To allow marriage in the third generation with the cognates was almost equivalent to the total negation of sapiṇḍa exogamy. Marriage between brother and sister is the marriage in the second generation. We have seen that the Indo-Aryans never countenanced such incestuous connection. If marriage is allowed in the third generation i.e. between the cross-cousins and between parallel cousins on the mother's side,—marriage between parallel cousins on the father's side being quite out of the question even in the early Ṛigveda time—for all practical purposes we may say that in Vedic times exogamous restrictions based on sapiṇḍa relationship did not exist. Even in Brāhmaṇa times, cross-cousin marriages and marriages in the fourth generation were in vogue. But, as sept exogamy that avoided an unlimited number of agnatic generations was being gradually accepted by the Indo-Aryans, some advance in the number of generations to be avoided under sapiṇḍa exogamy was inevitable. I shall try hereafter to trace the history of such extension.

I have already given my reasons for considering Manu, the first law-giver of the Indo-Aryans. Even in the Bhṛigu's recension of Manu-Smṛiti a large portion of the older work of Manu has been preserved though Bhṛigu may have introduced suitable changes here and there. Manu's rule of exogamy is comparatively mild and loose; and that fact can be only explained by assuming that Bhṛigu retained the traditional rules of marriage as they

may have been settled by the great Manu. I consider the rule of exogamy, given in the Manu-Smṛiti, to have been framed not between the interval of 200 B. C. and 200 A.D., the limits given by Dr. Bühler for the composition of the Smṛiti; but I assign to Manu's rule of exogamy a far greater antiquity. Even the present metrical Manu-Smṛiti gives us insight into the period preceding the Sūtra works. In Manu we find the first extension of sapiṇḍa exogamy. In enunciating the rule of exogamy, Manu attaches equal importance to the avoidance of sagotra relations of the father and the sapiṇḍa relations of the father and the mother.[10] We must now decide what Manu meant by prohibiting marriage with the sapiṇḍa of the father and the mother. Did Manu desire to prohibit marriage up to seven generations on the father's side and five on the mother's side? In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa marriage in the third generation is spoken of with approval.[11] Within a short space of time it was not to be expected that sapiṇḍa exogamy would make such a wide stride as to prohibit marriage till the seventh and the fifth generations. Manu has explained the word 'sapiṇḍa' twice in his work. "To three ancestors water must be offered; to three funeral cake is given. The fourth is the giver of these obations. The fifth has no connection with them."[12] "But the sapiṇḍa relationship ceases with the seventh person. The Samānodaka relationship ceases when the origin and the name are no longer remembered."[13] According to the first verse, sāpiṇḍya ceases in the fifth generation; and according to the second verse, it ceases in the eighth. Obviously the first verse defines the older conception of 'sāpiṇḍya' while the later

10 Manu. III—5.

11 Ś. Brāhmaṇa, 1-8-3-6; S. B. E. Vol. XII. p. 238.

12 Manu. IX—186.

13 Manu. V—60.

conception of sāpiṇḍya is explained by the second verse. Sūtra-writers consider that the family relationship ceases after the seventh generation. Thus, Āpastamba,[14] Vasishṭha[15] and Baudhāyana[16] declare that the inheritance passes to the spiritual teacher after the sapiṇḍas. Eighth generation is neither entitled to inheritance nor is it rendered impure by death. The Samānodaka relationship, mentioned by Manu in his verse (V-60), extends beyond seven generations; so, the second verse, quoted above, represents the later view. The traditional view has been preserved in the first verse (i. e. IX—186). According to that verse, sāpiṇḍya ought to cease in the fifth generation. Manu in very strong terms condemns marriage in the third generation in the following two verses :

Paitṛishvaseyīm bhaginīm svasrīyām māturevacha ।
Mātuścha bhrātustanayām gatvā chāndrāyaṇam charet ॥
XI—171

Etāstisrastu bhāryārthe nopayachchhettu buddhimān ।
Jñātitvenānupeyāstāḥ patati hyupayannadhaḥ ॥ XI-- 172

In the first verse Manu lays down that for approaching the sister-like three girls, namely, father's sister's daughter, mother's sister's daughter and maternal uncle's daughter one should perform a Lunar penance. In the second verse Manu advises that an intelligent person should not take any of these three girls for his wife; because they are unapproachable being one's relatives. If anybody would marry them still, he becomes an outcast. The three girls, mentioned in the verse, represent the third generation. In the Ṛigveda times and in the Brāhmaṇa times people could marry and did marry their cognatic relations in the third generation. It will be a

---

14 Āpa. Dha. II—14-3.
15 Vasishṭha. XVII—82.
16 Bau. Dha. I—11-13.

reasonable conclusion, therefore, that Manu primarily wants to prohibit marriage in the third generation; and so, he declares that a person, marrying with the cognates in the third generation, becomes an outcast. This is not, however, to be taken in a literal sense; because in the first verse Manu has already prescribed a Lunar penance for connection with a woman in the third generation. That Manu was not at all serious in declaring that a man, marrying his maternal uncle's daughter etc., becomes an outcast may be seen from the following fact. Gautama gives a list of sinners who become outcasts on account of their various sins. The first four sinners in that list are: (1) murderer of a Brahmin, (2) one who drinks spirituous liquors, (3) violator of Guru's bed and (4) one who has connection with the female relatives of his father and mother (within six generations). Gautama next declares that the first three sins cannot be expiated by any penance according to Manu.[17] The fourth sin is the connection with the sapiṇḍa relation of the mother and the father. In the opinion of Gautama Manu does not consider the fourth sin inexpiable. It could be expiated by Lunar or some other penance. We know that marriage in the third generation of cognates was current in India at one time and it is still current in the Deccan. In all probability, marriage in the third generation was authoritatively prohibited for the first time by Manu; and naturally he cannot be expected to make it an inexpiable sin. From Manu's definition of sāpiṇḍya as is implied in verse (IX—186), it is possible to argue that Manu prohibited marriage even in the fourth generation. I am, however, inclined to think that Manu probably does not object to marriage in the fourth generation in as much as, instead of condemning sapiṇḍa marriage in

17 Gautama. XXI—9.

general terms which could have included prohibition of marriage in the fourth generation, he particularly condemns all possible sapiṇḍa connections in the third generation. Medhātithi in his commentary observes that such an inference should not be drawn from Manu's condemnation of the three possible matings in the third generation. In interpreting Manu one cannot, however, entirely rely on Medhātithi who wrote his commentary at least a thousand years after the compilation of the Smṛiti. In the ninth century sapiṇḍa exogamy in its present comprehensive form was finally established; and Medhātithi had to interprete Manu's text accordingly. Manu is regarded as the highest authority on Dharma by the ancient as well as the modern law-givers; and every one is anxious to show that his opinions are in accordance with those of Manu. It is a well-known fact that Manu has prescribed no penance for the breach of the rule of sept exogamy. Medhātithi has openly admitted the fact. Still, writers like Vijñāneśvara have tried to show that in condemning connection with a Vṛishalī Manu really condemns a woman married to a sagotra person. Vijñāneśvara quotes a certain Smṛiti which he takes care not to name; and on its authority he lays down that there are in all five kinds of Vṛishalīs i.e. Chāṇḍālīs, and the woman married to a sagotra person is one among the five. Thus, it will be seen that every writer tried his utmost to show that his views were in agreement with the ancient works and especially with the work of Manu. We need not be surprised to find that Medhātithi also is at pains to prove that the extensive sapiṇḍa exogamy that was current in his times was in conformity with the preaching of Manu. But leaving aside what Medhātithi thought of Manu's idea of sapiṇḍa exogamy, I do not think that in Manu's times sapiṇḍa exogamy had advanced any further than the avoidance of three genera-

tions. It should be further borne in mind that the avoidance of the third generation of the cognates in marriage was a distinct and important advance in the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy. Marriage between cross-cousins was a very popular custom in the ancient society and even in modern societies in which it is permitted it is equally popular. To prohibit cross-cousin marriage to which the Indo-Aryans were accustomed in the Vedic times was not an easy task. It was certainly with a great deal of difficulty that the people could be convinced as to the inadvisibility of marriage in the third generation. The Southerners on this point ever remained stubborn. There are special reasons that can account for this attitude of the Southerners and I shall deal with them later on. For the time being, it is sufficient to note that the avoidance of the third generation in marriage was rather a hard pill to swallow for the Indo-Aryan society—harder perhaps than the acceptance of sept exogamy in as much as they were in the habit of avoiding some generations of agnates in marriage from very ancient times. But once the principle of avoiding the third generation of cognates in marriage was accepted, further progress of sapiṇḍa exogamy followed in ordinary course.

Sapiṇḍa Exogamy in Sūtra Period

When the Sūtra-writers composed their works, sept exogamy was made more rigid, and expiatory penances of more or less serious character were prescribed for the non-observance of the rule of sept exogamy. Along with the growth of sept exogamy we find a corresponding growth of sapiṇḍa exogamy. Thus, Gautama sanctions marriage after seven generations from the father's side and five generations from the mother's side.[18] In other words Gautama allowed marriage in the eighth

18 Gautama. IV—3, 5.

generation from the father's side and the sixth generation from the mother's side. We must not, however, take Gautama as our guide in determining the nature of the social laws of the Sūtra times. I have already pointed out that Gautama is an extreme writer of the puritan cult. He always writes in an idealistic tone. Whether a particular rule was in actual practice, he does not seem to care for. For example, the question of inheritance. After the failure of the sapiṇḍa and Sakulya relations (in all seven generations) Sūtra-writers allowed the inheritance to pass to the spiritual teacher.[19] Gautama is not content with this arrangement. He would allow the sagotra after the sapiṇḍa relations and finally the samāna-pravaras to inherit the property of the deceased.[20] Now this is a purely impracticable view. Neither in Sūtra times nor in after days, the sagotras and the samāna-pravaras are allowed to inherit. In the matter of sapiṇḍa exogamy also, we need not take Gautama's words too seriously. It is true, no doubt, that in Upper India in certain provinces the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy as given by Gautama holds good even now. But it does not follow from this that sapiṇḍa exogamy in Sūtra times was as extensive as was preached by Gautama.

Dr. Bühler's translation of the Sūtras in question is incorrect. According to his translation, a marriage may be contracted between persons who are not related within six degrees on the father's side and within four degrees on the mother's side (S.B.E. Vol. II. p. 194). The original Sanskrit words in the Sūtras do not, however, sanction this sense. The texts of the Sūtras run thus: "ūrdhvam saptamāt pitṛibandhubhyaḥ (Gautama.IV-3.)"

19 Āpa. Dha. II—14-3, Vasishṭha. XVII—82, Bau. Dha. 1—11-13.

20 Gautama. XXVIII—21.

and "mātṛibandhubhyaḥ pañchamāt (Gautama. IV-5.)." The word 'ūrdhvam' clearly excludes seven and five generations on the father's and mother's side respectively. Thus, Gautama allows marriage only in the eighth and sixth generations counted from the father and the mother. Later commentators including Aparārka and Vijñāneśvara have uniformly interpreted the above Sūtras in the same way.

Baudhāyana nowhere in his Kalpa-Sūtra gives the rule of exogamy in its entirety. In his Mahāpravarādhyāya he describes[21] in detail sept exogamy, but not the sapiṇḍa exogamy. It is true that Pravarādhyāya is not the proper place for enunciating the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy. But neither in his Gṛihya-Sūtra nor in his Dharma-Sūtra, Baudhāyana cares to define sapiṇḍa exogamy. It is not to be concluded from this, however, that Baudhāyana did not recognise any sort of sapiṇḍa exogamy. He certainly stood for the exclusion of three generations of the cognates; because at the beginning of his Dharma-Sūtra he declares that there is dispute regarding five practices in the South and the North. Among the practices peculiar to the South, one is the marriage with maternal uncle's and paternal aunt's daughters. The Southerners married their cognatic relations in the third generation. Baudhāyana is, of course, opposed to this practice; but he enjoins that such peculiar practices should be confined to those regions where they are actually current. Thus,a Southerner will not incur any sin if he marries in the third generation; but an up-country man doing the same will be considered sinful. Baudhāyana is ready to recognise local custom. He at the same time records that Gautama, the puritan, will not recognize local custom. "Gautama declares that

21 Pravara-Mañjarī, p. 136.

these practices either of the South or of the North are opposed to the tradition of the Śishṭas and one should not take heed of them."[22] Thus, it will be seen that in Sūtra times in Northern India marriages in the third generation were entirely stopped; while in the Deccan they were current both from the mother's and father's side. Beyond the fact that Baudhāyana did not sanction marriage in the third generation as far as Northern India was concerned, we have no definite information regarding Baudhāyana's views on sapiṇḍa exogamy.

Āpastamba also does not exactly define the generations of the sapiṇḍas to be avoided in marriage. In connection with the marriage formula, Āpastamba omits to use the word 'sapiṇḍa' and simply lays down that one should not give his daughter in marriage to a man related on the father's or mother's side.[23] Haradatta, the commentator, supplements the formula by adding the words 'within six degrees.' I do not think, however, that Haradatta is justified in supplementing the formula in that way. The original Sanskrit word used in this connection by Āpastamba is 'Yoni-sambandhām' and it may mean any number of generations connected with the father and the mother. Besides, how is the expression (within six generations) to be construed both with father and mother alike? No writer, ancient or modern, insists on the avoidance of six generations on the mother's side. So, the question how many generations of the cognates must be avoided in marriage according to Āpastamba remains unsettled. Looking to the contemporary literature, it is probable that Āpastamba did not allow marriage in the third generation. Whether he extended the limit of prohibition any further is a matter for speculation only.

22 Bau. Dha. I—2—(1—8); S. B. E. Vol. XIV. pp. 146, 147.
23 Āpa. Dha. II—11-16.

Although Āpastamba and Baudhāyana do not clearly state the generations up to which sāpiṇḍya is to be recognised, Vasishṭha is explicit on this point. He allows marriage in the fifth generation on the mother's side and in the seventh from the father's side.[24] Gautama would allow marriage in the eighth generation from the father and in the sixth from the mother. Vasishṭha unlike Gautama is a practical writer; so, we may reasonably conclude that by the time that the Vasishṭha-Dharma-Sūtra was written, sapiṇḍa exogamy was being extended from the father's as well as the mother's side.

None of the Sūtra-writers except Gautama has prescribed any penance for the non-observance of the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy. Gautama alone declares that one, marrying a sapiṇḍa relation of the father and the mother, becomes an outcast.[25] It must be remembered in this connection that Gautama is the only Sūtra-writer who compares the breach of the rule of sept exogamy with the violation of Guru's bed.[26] Other Sūtra-writers, although they enunciate the rules of sept exogamy and sapiṇḍa exogamy, do not prescribe any penance for the breach of those rules.

Sapiṇḍa Exogamy as explained by Smṛiti-writers

According to Yājñavalkya, the girl to be married should be asagotra, asamāna-pravara and asapiṇḍa. Yājñavalkya unlike Manu is, however, careful to explain the word sapiṇḍa. He allows marriage in the fifth generation from the mother and in the seventh from the father, and not in the sixth and the eighth generation as declared by Gautama. Yājñavalkya's denotation of the word sapiṇḍa is in complete agreement with that of Vasishṭha.

24 Vasishṭha. VIII—2.
25 Gautama. XXI—1.
26 Gautama. XXIII—12.

For incestuous connections he prescribed penances in the following verses :—

Sakhibhāryākumārīshu svayonishu antyajāsu cha ǀ
Sagotrāsu sutastrīshu gurutalpasamaṃ smṛitaṃ ǁ
Pituḥ svasāraṃ mātuścha mātulānīm snushāmapi ǀ
Mātuḥ sapatnīm bhaginīm āchāryatanayām tathā ǁ
Āchāryapatnīm svasutāṃ gachchhan cha gurutalpagaḥ ǀ

Yājñavalkya, chapter on penances, 231, 232, 233.

In these verses sagotra marriage is condemned and is made comparable to Gurutalpa; but as to sapiṇḍa marriage the author keeps silent. Viśvarūpa in his commentary interpretes the word 'svayoni' as sapiṇḍa relations from the father's as well as the mother's side. But apparently this interpretation is a forced one. Aparārka renders the word 'svayoni' as one's sister, and that is the proper meaning. Gautama used the expression 'Mātṛi-pitṛi-yonisambandhāgaḥ' for condemning sapiṇḍa marriage.[28] In another place, Gautama uses the word 'svayoni' for one's sister[29]. And all commentators of Gautama give the same meaning. To denote mother's sapiṇḍas Āpastaṃba used the expression 'Mātuḥ yonisaṃbandha.'[30] In Manu-Smṛiti also, the word 'svayoni' means one's uterine sister.[31] No commentator of Manu renders it otherwise. It may be contended that in the two verses from Yājñavalkya quoted above, the word 'bhaginī' actually occurs, and therefore the word 'svayoni' in the first verse should be made to yield some other sense. This contention is, however, untenable. In the three verses quoted above, there is plenty of tautology. In the first verse 'sutastrī' i.e. son's wife has been mentioned; in the second verse

28 Gautama. XXI—1.
29 Gautama. XXIII—12.
30 Āpa. Dha. II—11-16.
31 Manu. XI—58, 169.

the same thing is told by the word 'snushā'; and above all, snushā and sutastrī are both included in the sagotras. If svayoni in the first verse is rendered as sapiṇḍa relations, the whole of the second verse will be superfluous. It seems certain, therefore, that Yājñavalkya did not prescribe any penance for sapiṇḍa marriage.

Nārada who is a writer of the sixth century has prescribed the severest penance, namely, the excision of the organ for connection with a sagotra woman.[32] Along with the sagotra female, connection with nineteen other females has been condemned. But in that long list any female relative in the third or fourth generation is not mentioned. The verses in question from Nārada which are often quoted by later commentators are worthy of notice.

"Mother, mother's sister, mother-in-law, maternal uncle's wife, father's sister,the wives of uncle, friend and pupil, sister, sister's friend, daughter-in-law, daughter, female Guru, a woman belonging to one's gotra,a woman who has approached for help, the queen, a nun, a nurse and a chaste woman of the highest class—a person approaching any one of these is called the violator of Guru's bed. There is no other fitting punishment for the sin than the exision of the organ."

Here it will be seen that father's sister and mother's sister are included in the list, but not their daughters. In Vishṇu-Smṛiti also, an equally large list of females is given connection with whom is considered incestuous.[33] No cognates in the third or fourth generation find place in that list. Both Vishṇu[34] and Nārada[35], in giving the qualifications of the bride, insist on the avoidance of a

32 Nārada. XII—73-75; S. B. E. Vol. XXXIII. pp. 179, 180.

33 Vishṇu. XXXVI—4-7.

34 Vishṇu. XXIV—10.

35 Nārada. XII—7.

sagotra, sapravara and sapiṇḍa girl; but they prescribe penance only for sagotra connection and not for sapiṇḍa connection. Penances are prescribed for connection with the cognates in the first and second generations; but cognates in the first and second generations were never considered marriageable from the earliest Vedic times.

In Parāśara-Smṛiti also, penances are prescribed for incestuous connection with several females including the sagotra woman.[36] But not a single sapiṇḍa female in the third or fourth generation is mentioned.

Thus, all Sūtra-writers except Gautama and Smṛiti-writers like Yājñavalkya, Nārada, Vishṇu and even Parāśara do not prescribe any penance for marriage with a sapiṇḍa relation, although many of them have prescribed penances for sagotra marriage and for connection with cognates in the first and the second generations. To infer that these legislators approve of sapiṇḍa marriage would be nonsensical, because every one among these legislators insists that sapiṇḍa relations from the father's and mother's side should be avoided in marriage. Why do they not then prescribe any penance for marriage with sapiṇḍa relations? To answer this question we must go back to the history of sapiṇḍa marriage. In Vedic times some generations of agnates were avoided in marriage; but cognates could intermarry in the third or fourth generation. Manu tried to raise the number of generations to be avoided; and he particularly aimed at stopping marriage in the third generation. Later writers like Vasishṭha and Yājñavalkya raised the limit of sāpiṇḍya up to seven generations from the father's side and five from the mother's side. But, when one takes into consideration the fact that Manu and Gautama are the only two authoritative writers who prescribe penance

36 Parāśara. X—11, 12.

for sapiṇḍa marriage, one would be inclined to think that the injunction to marry outside the sapiṇḍa relations was not quite of an imperative character. I do not mean to say that the rule, prohibiting marriage between sapiṇḍa relations, was only a recommendatory one. But there was a world of difference between a sagotra and sapiṇḍa marriage. Wherever sagotra marriage is condemned, the husband is asked to abandon the wife, the marriage being declared completely null and void. All Sūtra and Smṛiti writers agree on this. Till the seventh or eighth century after Christ the issue of the sagotra union was not called a Chāṇḍāla ; but as soon as the knowledge of sagotra marriage was there, the marriage was at once dissolved. Sapiṇḍa marriage may not have been approved of by legislators; but, if a sapiṇḍa marriage did take place, it was not certainly declared invalid. Herein lies the main difference between the rules of sept exogamy and sapiṇḍa exogamy. Breach of the former nullified the marriage, while the breach of the latter was not thought a sufficient reason to vitiate it. This state of things lasted almost to the beginning of the period when independent Smṛiti-compositions ceased to be written and the commentators of the inspired ancient Smṛitis made their first appearance.

CHAPTER X

Development of the Rule of Sapiṇḍa Exogamy after the eighth century

The age of commentators set in, and we notice a change of attitude with the legislators on the question of sapiṇḍa exogamy. Thus, hereafter, one will observe that all writers on Dharma, either commentators or Nibandha-writers, with the exception of some Deccanis, take rather a strict view of sapiṇḍa exogamy and condemn marriage with the father's and mother's sapiṇḍas in clear terms. But with all that, sapiṇḍa exogamy never attained the rigidity and the strictness of gotra exogamy. Advocates of strict sapiṇḍa exogamy rely on the definition of the word 'sapiṇḍa' as given by Gautama, Yājñavalkya and other Smṛiti-writers. They often quote Śātātapa. Those writers and especially the writers from the Deccan who stand for contracting the limits of Sāpiṇḍya on either side generally quote Chaturviṁśati-mata and Shaṭtriṁśat-mata. Exact dates of these Smṛitis cannot be determined; and their authentic texts also have not been preserved. Both the smṛitis are quoted by Aparārka who wrote in the first half of the twelfth century. Contemporary literature is not generally quoted as an authority; and so, these Smṛitis must have been written some centuries prior to Aparārka. Chaturviṁśati-mata and Shaṭtriṁśat-mata, both quote Paiṭhīnasi. So, Paiṭhīnasi must be more ancient still. With these preliminary remarks I proceed to give a brief survey of the history of sapiṇḍa exogamy after the eighth century, which is roughly considered to be the beginning of the age of commentators.

Viśvarūpa, the commentator on Yājñavalkya-Smṛiti, while commenting on the definition of 'sapiṇḍa,' observes that there are four views current on this point. First

view is the extreme view of Gautama that allows marriage in the eighth and sixth generations from the father's and the mother's side. The second view is that of Yājñavalkya, sanctioning marriage in the fifth generation from the mother's side and the seventh from the father's side. Avoidance of five generations on either side is propounded by Śaṅkha. The fourth view will tolerate marriage in the fourth generation, and it is based on the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (1-8-3-6) passage "Tasmādu samānādeva purushāt etc." In explaining the passage, the commentator observes that three generations are to be counted excluding the first ancestor; and thus, the passage approves of marriage in the fourth generation only. In the opinion of Viśvarūpa, each preceding view is preferable to the later. The fourth view should be operative in the case of the bride only.[1] The whole question is discussed by the writer with an unbiassed and open mind; and although he would prefer Gautama's view of sapiṇḍa exogamy to the other three views, one may see that he does not consider the other views sinful. Viśvarūpa wrote in the first half of the ninth century and his remarks show that although Gautama's strict rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy was there, marriages could take place in the fourth generation from the mother's side and the fifth from the father's side without incurring any sin. We have already seen that Manu was possibly the first writer on Dharma-Śāstra who prohibited marriage in the third generation, and it seems that in Northern India marriages in the third generation were not current in Viśvarūpa's time i. e. the ninth century after Christ. Almost total disappearance of marriage in the third generation can be inferred from the comments of Viśvarūpa on the verse "Sakhibhāryā-Kumārīshu etc" (Yājña. Chapter on penances, 231.). He interpretes the word 'Svayoni' as the relative of one's

1 · Viśvarūpa, part 1, p. 62.

father and mother, such as father's sister's daughter etc.[2] As I have already shown, the interpretation is wrong. But apart from that, the fact that the commentators thought it necessary to put such an interpretation on the word shows that marriage in the third generation was not definitely regarded sinful, even in Northern India.

Medhātithi accepts Gautama's definition of sapiṇḍa relationship in marriage. In enunciating the rule of exogamy, Manu does not define the generations to be avoided on either side. The commentator suggests that the word sapiṇḍa used by Manu should be explained in conformity with the view of Gautama. Manu does not prescribe any penance for sagotra marriage. In the same way he does not prescribe any penance for sapiṇḍa marriage. He condemns, however, in unequivocal terms, marriage in the third generation; and if such a marriage does take place, he recommends the performance of a Lunar penance. I have already tried to show that in Manu's times sapiṇḍa exogamy did not extend to the eighth and the sixth generations, and as he condemns marriage in the third generation only, he probably did not object to the union of the cognates in the fourth generation. Medhātithi, writing his commentary in the tenth century, could not interprete the text in this light. He warns his readers not to infer that Manu allowed marriage in the fourth generation and onward, because he chanced to condemn it only in the third generation. In the commentator's opinion such an inference would be both illogical and unauthorised.

Aparārka who flourished two centuries later than Medhātithi faithfully follows Gautama's rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy. He quotes both Vishṇu and Nārada in support

2 Viśvarūpa, part 2, p. 91.

of the definition. The verse quoted from Nārada runs thus:—

Saptamāt pañchamāt arvāk bandhubhyaḥ pitṛimātṛitaḥ ।
Avivāhyā sagotrā cha samānapravarā tathā. ॥

In this verse the word 'Bandhubhyaḥ' is really superfluous; and as Aparārka does not give any special explanation of it, we may presume that he also considered it to mean nothing particular or peculiar. The verse is not found in the text of Nārada published in the S. B. E. series. Great importance is attached to this word by later writers; and they utilize this text of Nārada for a further extension of the limits of sapiṇḍa exogamy. Aparārka then quotes Paiṭhīnasi who lays down that either seven or five generations should be avoided or five and three generations should be avoided. Aparārka remarks that the second alternative of Paiṭhīnasi should prevail only when the bride and the bridegroom are of different castes. It is not applicable to ordinary cases where the bride and the bridegroom are of the same caste, because Vishṇu lays down that "Persons, marrying in the fifth and the seventh generations .. ..are rendered 'Patita'–fallen and are reduced to the state of a Śūdra." This verse also is not traced in Vishṇu's text, published in S. B. E. series. As Aparārka quotes this verse from Vishṇu, it is clear that he prefers Gautama's view allowing marriage in the eighth and sixth generations to Yājñavalkya's view allowing marriage in the seventh and fifth generations. Aparārka finds fault with the argument of those who want to narrow down sāpiṇḍya to the third and fifth generations. In the first chapter I have shown how Aparārka has distorted the text from the Ṛigveda, approving marriage in the third generation with the cognates.[3] Baudhāyana has recorded the practice of

3 See supra, p. 14.

marriage between cross-cousins, current in the Deccan, and he has allowed it or rather connived at it on the ground that local custom sanctioned such marriage. Aparārka, however, is not in a mood to accept this compromise. A local custom can hold its ground only when it is not opposed to the Vedas; and in Aparārka's opinion there is nothing in the Vedas that supports marriage in the third generation. As regards the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa passage (1-8-3-6), the commentator remarks that it is a general text and no particular inference can be legitimately drawn from it. Besides, Śātātapa has prescribed a penance for marriage in the third generation.[4] Thus, although Aparārka insists on the prohibition of marriage within seven and five generations on the father's and the mother's side, it does not seem that he considered the marriage in the fourth generation and onward definitely void, because in his comments on the verse (Yājña. Chapter on penances, 231), he does not interprete the word 'Svayoni' as sapiṇḍa relations of the father and the mother, as Viśvarūpa had formerly done.[5]

Vijñāneśvara who was almost a contemporary of Aparārka discusses at great length the real meaning of the word 'piṇḍa' in 'sapiṇḍa'. I have given a gist of that discussion at the beginning of the previous chapter and as we are not very materially concerned with the discussion, I may proceed to examine the exact limits of Sāpiṇḍya as defined by the commentator. Vijñāneśvara's Mitāksharā is a standard work on Hindu law and his views on sapiṇḍa exogamy deserve our careful attention. The line from Yājñavalkya–the fifth from the mother's side and the seventh from the father's–is interpreted by Vijñāneśvara to mean the prohibition of the marriage in the fifth and seventh generations, and the allowance to

---

4 Aparārka, pp. 80-83. 5 Aparārka, p. 1048.

marry in the sixth and the eighth generations. This interpretation of the line, given both by Vijñāneśvara and Aparārka, is not at all natural; and Bāḷambhaṭṭa in his gloss on Mitāksharā has made an indirect admission of the fact. He observes that Vijñāneśvara interpretes the original text in accordance with the text of Gautama (IV-2)and the text of Matsyapurāṇa (XVIII-29).[6] 'Mitāksharā quotes both Vasishṭha and Paiṭhīnasi, though a bit incorrectly, as pointed out by Bāḷambhaṭṭa. The texts in question read as follows: "Fifth from the mother's bandhus and the seventh from the father's bandhus (Vasishṭha VIII-3) " and "one should take for a wife the fifth woman from the mother and the seventh from the father, or the third from the mother and the fifth from the father". Vijñāneśvara observes on these texts that Paiṭhīnasi gives the minimum limits of sāpiṇḍya, and the words 'pañchamīm' and 'saptamīm,' used by both Vasishṭha and Paiṭhīnasi, should be understood to prohibit marriage in these degrees and to allow it only in the next degrees. The only reason that Vijñāneśvara can put forth in support of this forced interpretation of the clear texts of Vasishṭha, Yājñavalkya and Paiṭhīnasi is that only thus interpreted, the texts will not oppose the views of writers like Gautama. From this explanation of Vijñāneśvara, we may see that the law-givers of the twelfth century were not satisfied with the limits of generations as prescribed by Vasishṭha, Yājñavalkya etc. Whether this extension of sapiṇḍa exogamy was equally welcome to the general public is another question. Thus, while explaining away the latter portion of Paiṭhīnasi's text which sanctions union in the third and the fifth generations, Vijñāneśvara remarks that this alternative rule of Paiṭhīnasi should be operative in the case

6 Mitāksharā, Book I. p. 112.

of Anuloma sons.[7] In his comments on the verses 'Sakhi-bhāryā-kumārīshu' etc. Vijñāneśvara first quotes Bṛihad-Yama who declares that connection with females in the first and second generations of sapiṇḍa instantly turns a man an outcast.[8] Gautama, however, condemns connection with sapiṇḍa females as a whole; and according to Gautama, it is a Mahā-pātaka or a great sin. Mitāksharā, however, argued that, as Gautama places the sin of connection with sapiṇḍa relations mid-way between Mahā-pātakas i. e. serious sins and upapātakas i. e. common sins, connection with sapiṇḍa relations should be considered a sin of ordinary nature, neither a serious sin nor a minor sin. Exhaustive as is the work of Vijñāneśvara and detailed though the penances he prescribes for sagotra marriage, he prescribes no penance for sapiṇḍa marriage, thus lending support to my theory that marriage within the prohibited degrees on either side, although very rare, was not considered absolutely void.

Devaṇa, the writer of Smṛiti-Chandrikā, a Nibandha-composition of the thirteenth century has written an eloquent chapter called ' the defence of marriage with one's maternal uncle's daughter'. With his powerful argument he almost annihilates the principle of sapiṇḍa exogamy. His principal contention is that a woman, as soon as she is married according to the Brāhma form of marriage, loses her father's gotra and joins the gotra of her husband. By the same analogy she is freed from the sāpiṇḍya belonging to her before her marriage. Devaṇa quotes Mārkaṇḍeya as an authority on this point. " In the case of a girl who is married according to the Brāhma form, the offering of the piṇḍa and water should be made by the husband's gotra. In the Āsura and

7 Mitāksharā, Book. I. p. 112.

8 Mitāksharā, Book III. p. 290.

other froms of marriage these things should be done according to the father's gotra." The form of marriage, most current among the Brahmins, is the Brāhma form; and in accordance with the authority of Mārkaṇḍeya, father's sister is not to be considered his sapiṇḍa, and the mother, being married by the Brāhma form, is not to be regarded a sapiṇḍa of her father or her brother. In this way marriage with maternal uncle's daughter and paternal aunt's daughter is not a sapiṇḍa marriage. If we thus grant that in the Brāhma form of marriage, a complete change of gotra and sāpiṇḍya takes place, why should marriage with mother's sister and mother's sister's daughter be not allowed? Devaṇa's answer to this question is that there is nothing wrong technically in such a marriage. Popular custom does not allow it, and so it does not take place. How are we then to interprete the texts of Manu, Gautama, Yājñavalkya, Nārada, Vishṇu and other writers who emphasize the necessity of observing the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy? According to Smṛiti-Chandrikā, these texts apply to those cases only where marriage has been consecrated according to Āsura or Gāndharva form of marriage. The author further points out that the generations to be avoided according to Gautama and other writers are to be counted from the bandhus of the father and the bandhus of the mother. Besides this, he quotes Chaturviṁśati-mata that sanctions marriage in the third or fourth generation. His principal stand, however, is that a girl, married according to the Brāhma form of marriage, can have no sapiṇḍa relation distinct from her husband's. Thus, Devaṇa, as far as the Brāhma form of marriage is concerned—and Brāhma form is the most prevalent form of marriage among high class Hindus and especially among the Brahmins—practically wipes off the restrictions based upon sāpiṇḍya. One may, however, see that though Devaṇabhaṭṭa may be technically right, he is after

all indulging in sophistry and is playing with words. Writing some two thousand years before Devaṇa when Manu laid down the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy, he certainly did not enunciate the rule to apply only to the Āsura form of marriage—a form which has been condemned not only by Manu, but by every other writer on Dharma. Devaṇa himself seems conscious of this; because he, in defending marriage in the third generation, too often shifts his ground. He finally observes that Maṇu's verse (III-5), giving the rule of exogamy, recommends a non-sapiṇḍa marriage which he considers 'praśasta' i. e. praiseworthy. Sapiṇḍa marriage may not be praiseworthy, but it does not at all follow that it was illegal.[9] Devaṇa is avowedly a Deccani writer; and from his writings we are not entitled to determine the state of sapiṇḍa exogamy in Northern India; but we may reasonably infer that in Northern India also, sapiṇḍa exogamy was not certainly as strict as the gotra exogamy.

In Chaturvarga-Chintāmaṇi another work of the thirteenth century, written in the Deccan by Hemādri, a separate section has been devoted to prescribe penances for marrying a daughter of mother's sister.[10] Sagotra and samānapravara marriages also are dealt with in the same section. Hemādri, however, does not prescribe any penance for sapiṇḍa marriage in general; nor for marrying a maternal uncle's or paternal aunt's daughter. On the authority of Devala, Hemādri declares that mother's sister is nothing short of the mother. In the third generation of the cognates, there are only three possible unions; and as Hemādri singles out one from among the three and condemns it, it is clear that he approves of the other two connections, namely, marriage with ma-

9 Smṛiti-Chandrikā, Saṁskāra-kāṇḍa, pp. 180--200.

10 Chaturvarga-Chintāmaṇi, Prāyaśchitta--khaṇḍa, p. 365.

ternal uncle's daughter and marriage with paternal aunt's daughter.

Mādhava, the great Deccani writer of the fourteenth century, is an open advocate of marriage with the cognates in the third generation. His line of argument is the same as adopted by Devaṇa. The only difference between Devaṇa and Mādhava is that the former is not quite confident of his ground and so he offers more than one explanation in defence ot marriage in the third generation; while the latter confidently takes one definite stand, namely, that the maternal uncle's and the paternal aunt's daughters are not the sapiṇḍa of the mother and the father, and thus, there is nothing wrong in marrying them. Mādhava goes a step further than Devaṇa and records the opinions of some writers to the effect that even in Āsura form of marriage where woman's original gotra and piṇḍa remain unchanged, a man may marry his cross-cousin with impunity provided he has the sanction of local custom. According to Devaṇa and Mādhava cross-cousin-marrirage, provided the parents were married according to the Brāhma form, is legal not only in the Deccan, but also in Northern India. They do not try to justify cross-cousin-marriage, on the doubtful authority of local custom. As females have no sapiṇḍa relations, distinct from their husband's after the celebration of their marriage according to Brāhma form, there can possibly be no objection to marrying in the third generation either in the South or in the North. The aid of local custom is invoked in those cases only where the marriage is celebrated according to Āsura form. This view has been put forth as the opinion of some; but as Mādhava does not adversely comment on this, we may take it that, though he may not be in complete agreement with that view, he is not opposed to it. In his comments on the verses of Parāśara, dealing with incestuous connections, Mā-

dhava prescribes no penance for connection in the third generation, although proper provision of penances has been made for connection with females in the second generation. Why Mādhava and Devaṇa did not allow the intermarriage of the children of two sisters is really a very important question ; but I must content myself here simply by mentioning the point as I propose to discuss the question fully in the next chapter.

Viśveśvara, the author of Madana-Pārijāta, writing his Nibandha near Delhi in the fifteenth century, propounds the extreme view of sapiṇḍa exogamy and observes that Vasishṭha's rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy should have only a limited application. Thus, four generations, as laid down by Vasishṭha, should be avoided from a stepmother of the same caste, while six generations should be avoided in the case of a female who is born of a Brahmin father and a Kshatriya or Vaiśya mother. I have already said that among the Smṛiti-writers and commentators none directly declares that a sapiṇḍa marriage is an invalid marriage. Viśveśvara, however, incidentally remarks that, if the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy is not observed, the girl, though married, is not entitled to be a wife.[11] This is an incidental remark of Viśveśvara and no serious consideration should be given to it, because he further lays down that even a Putrikā is not to be regarded a full wife. We know that Putrikā marriage, though disapproved from early Vedic times, was never considered invalid. Thus, in all probability, Viśveśvara's declarations on sapiṇḍa marriage and Putrikā marriage were merely idealistic and had no practical bearing.

Raghunandana, a Northern India writer in the fifteenth century, in his Udvāha-Tatva lays stress on the word bandhubhyaḥ, in the formula 'Pañchamīm mātṛiban-

11 Madana-Pārijāta, p. 140

dhubhyaḥ saptamīm pitṛibandhubhyaḥ'. Seven generations and five generations are not to be counted only from the father and the mother, but from the father's and mother's bandhus. Till the beginning of the fifteenth century, no writer had thought that the word 'bandhubhyaḥ' in the formula had any important bearing. No difference was made out between the two expressions, 'pañchamīm mātṛitaḥ' and 'pañchamīm mātṛibandhubhyaḥ'. A certain Smṛiti whose author is unknown defines the bandhus in the following way. "The sons of his father's paternal aunt, the sons of his father's maternal aunt and the sons of his father's maternal uncle must be considered his father's bandhus. The sons of his mother's paternal aunt, the sons of his mother's maternal aunt and the sons of his mother's maternal uncle must be regarded his mother's bandhus." Writers after the fifteenth century are of opinion that five generations must be avoided beginning with the bandhus of the mother, and seven generations from the father's bandhus, in addition to the usual avoidance of five generations from the mother's side and seven from the father's side. Thus, they aim at extending the limits of sapiṇḍa exogamy considerably. Viśveśvara hints this extension but does not illustrate it. Raghunandana fully illustrates the extension in his Udvāha-Tatva. He himself, however, seems conscious that the extension is carried too far and he qualifies his rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy by the following exception. A girl who is removed by three gotras from the bridegroom is not unmarriageable, though related within five and seven degrees as above described. " The three gotras in the case of the descendants of a bandhu are to be counted from his own (bandhu's) gotra. So also, in the case of the descendants of the ancestors of a bandhu, who is the father's or mother's maternal uncle's son, they are to be counted from the bandhu's own gotra. But in the case of the descendants of the ancestors of each

of the other bandhus, the three gotras are to be counted from his (bandhu's) maternal grandfather's gotra. This exception is based upon the text of Bṛihan–Manu and another of Matsyapurāṇa, cited in the Udvāha-Tatva". The exception may be illustrated by the following example. Suppose the paternal great grandfather of the bridegroom is of Śāṇḍilya gotra. His daughter by transfer by marriage is of Kāśyapa gotra. His daughter is of Vatsa gotra, and this daughter's daughter is of Bhāradvāja gotra. The maiden daughter of this last, being of Bhāradvāja gotra and being beyond three gotras i. e. Śāṇḍilya, Kāśyapa and Vatsa, is eligible for marriage though within the prohibited degrees. Śūlapāṇi, another Northern India writer, gives another exception to the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy. He allows the Kshatriya in all forms of marriage, and other castes in the Āsura and other inferior forms of marriage, to marry within the prohibited degrees, provided they do not marry within the fifth degree from the father's side and the third degree on the mother's side. This exception will be applicable in those cases only where a suitable match is not otherwise procurable. Raghunandan finds fault with this exception; but Paiṭhīnasi and Śākaṭāyana support it, and generally it is held valid even in Northern India.[12]

The question must now be considered whether this novel extension of sapiṇḍa exogamy that has been suggested by Viśveśvara and Raghunandan is justifiable. The extension is based upon the word ' bandhu', used in the formula of sapiṇḍa exogamy. In defining sapiṇḍa relationship for the purpose of marriage, only two important writers have used the word ' bandhu.' Thus, Gautama lays down, " ūrdhvam saptamāt, pitṛibandhubhyaḥ[13] " and

12 Banerjee, pp. 66-67.
13 Gautama. IV--3.

" Mātṛi-bandhubhyaḥ pañchamāt.[14] " The verse, attributed to Nārada, runs thus: " Saptamāt pañchamāt arvāk bandhubhyaḥ pitṛi-mātṛitaḥ." The two Sūtras of Gautama are translated in the S. B. E. series as follows: " Who are not related within six degrees on the father's side and within four degrees on the mother's side". Gautama-Dharma-Sūtra is translated in the S. B. E. series in accordance with the commentary of Haradatta. Another authoritative commentary on Gautama is Maskaribhāshya. There also, the same interpretation is accepted. As regards the verse, attributed to Nārada, the first thing that we must bear in mind is that in the Nārada-Smṛiti, translated in the S. B. E. series, the verse is not found. Aparārka has quoted the verse; but he does not attach any special importance to the word ' bandhu'. No Sūtra or Smṛiti writer has advised the avoidance of five and seven generations beginning with the bandhus of the mother and the father. Under these circumstances how would Nārada enunciate altogether a new principle ? Commentators and Nibandha-writers, till the fifteenth century do not seem to have taken any notice of the word 'bandhubhyaḥ' in Nārada's verse. I am inclined to think, therefore, that the word has no special significance in Nārada's formula of sapiṇḍa exogamy. Had the word been used in a particular sense, the writer would have first explained its denotation.

The subject of sapiṇḍa exogamy has been very exhaustively discussed by Kamalākara in his Nirṇaya-Sindhu. A Deccani Brahmin by caste, he was a resident of Benares and he finished his work there. Kamalākara mentions the extension of sapiṇḍa exogamy, propounded by Viśveśvara and Raghunandana and observes that five and seven generations are to be avoided from the mother's and father's bandhus. Like Raghunandana, the author of

14 Gautama. IV--5.

Nirṇaya-Sindhu also would permit marriage within the prohibited degrees, provided the girl is beyond three gotras. He approves of the limits of sāpiṇḍya, as defined by Gautama and declares that the texts of Vasishṭha and Vishṇupurāṇa that allow marriage in the fifth and seventh generations should be so interpreted, as would not oppose Gautama's view allowing marriage in the sixth and in the eighth generations.

Kamalākara takes his main stand on the following verse of Marīchi quoted in Aparārka. " People who marry in the fifth and the seventh generations, although they may be devoted to the performance of Vedic rites, are reduced to the state of a Śūdra ; and they (ultimately) fall down." This verse of Marīchi is also quoted in Smṛiti-Chandrikā. On the authority of Marīchi and Vishṇu, Nirṇaya-Sindhu refutes the opinions favouring the contraction of sapiṇḍa prohibitions. Prominent among those who stand for the contraction of the limits of sapiṇḍa exogamy are Paiṭhīnasi, Devaṇa Mādhava, Śākaṭāyana and Chaturviṁśati-mata. Paiṭhīnasi suggests two alternatives. One should have for his wife the fifth girl from the mother and the seventh from the father; or he may have the third girl from the mother and the fourth from the father. Mādhava considered the second alternative of Paiṭhīnasi an Anukalpa i. e. an alternative course that may be followed with impunity. Chaturviṁśati-mata is very clear and definite on this point. "One should marry the fifth girl from the mother's side and the seventh from the father's side. From a high family of a śrotriya ten past generations of whom are illustrious, one should marry the eighth girl or in her absence, the seventh girl or the fifth. On the father's side also, the same course should be followed. The seventh girl should be married or the sixth or the fifth. Thus marrying, one would not incur any sin, so says Śākaṭāyana. Manu,

Parāśara, Aṅgiras and Yama lay down that the third or the fourth girl on either side should be taken in marriage. One who marries according to the practice of his country and according to the tradition of his family is fit for all sort of intercourse in the society. Besides, the Vedas testify to the correctness of this conduct." In addition to the above authorities a passage is quoted, attributed to Parāśara. "Fourth or fifth man should marry the fourth girl. According to Parāśara, the fifth man may marry the sixth girl, but the fifth man should not marry the fifth girl". Kamalākara warns his readers that the views of Paiṭhīnasi and Chaturviṁśati-mata should not be regarded Anukalpas; because they are applicable only to particular cases. Where the bride and the bridegroom are of different castes, or where the bridegroom is an adopted son and also in the case of the stepmother the rules of Paiṭhīnasi and Chaturviṁśati-mata should be allowed to prevail. As to the verse, attributed to Parāśara, Kamalākara declares that the verse has been wrongly put in the name of Parāśara. He takes a strong objection to the cross-cousin-marriage, current in the Deccan and observes that Hemādri and Bopadeva, on the authority of Brahma-Purāṇa, recommend that the Carnatic Brahmin who marries his maternal uncle's daughter should not be invited to participate in a Śrāddha feast. Whatever Mādhava and such other great authorities may say, Nirṇaya-Sindhu would not countenance marriage in the third generation, even in the Deccan.[15]

Kamalākara approves of marriage in the eighth generation from the father and the sixth from the mother. Accepting this definition of sāpiṇḍya, 2121 girls in all are rendered unmarriageable, as far as sapiṇḍa prohibitions are concerned.[16] Rao Saheb Mandlik has prepared four

15 Nirṇayasindhu, pp. 309—320.
16 Nirṇayasindhu, p. 321.

tables to illustrate how 2121 girls are rendered unmarriageable due to sapiṇḍa prohibitions. In the preparation of these tables Mandlik has taken three things for granted; first, that the bridegroom is going to be married for the first time; secondly, that each married couple has one son and one daughter; and thirdly, that the brides who are excluded by reason of their relationship through the stepmother or through adoption of either the bride or bridegroom are not included in the calculation.[17] It will be further observed that five and seven generations are not calculated from the bandhus of the father and the mother. In explaining the text of Nārada, " saptamāt pañchamāt arvāk bandhubhyaḥ mātṛipitṛitaḥ, " Kamalākara has recommended that five and seven generations should be counted from the bandhus of the mother and the father. But, in calculating the actual number of girls that are rendered unmarriageable due to sapiṇḍa prohibitions, Kamalākara does not take into consideration five and seven generations from the bandhus of the father and the mother. If the sapiṇḍas of the bandhus of the father and mother are calculated, the number of unmarriageable girls will be much larger.

Just as Gautama is an idealistic writer among the ancients, so is Kamalākara among the moderns. In the matter of gotra exogamy Kamalākara is not satisfied with the avoidance of the father's gotra i. e. the gotra of oneself. He would insist on the avoidance of also the mother's gotra. As regards sapiṇḍa exogamy, he preaches it in its most comprehensive form. He would like to avoid five and seven generations from the bandhus of the mother and the father. He would not allow local custom to prevail in the Deccan. That Kamalākara was not a practical writer may be seen from the fact that, although he

17 Mandlik, " Vyavahāra--Mayūkha, " p. 352.

prescribes very rigid rules, he is not very particular as to their application. Thus, he lays down that five and seven generations from the bandhus of the mother and the father should be avoided in marriage; but he ignores the rule when he actually calculates the number of unmarriageable girls. The same thing may be said about the avoidance of the mother's gotra. Avoidance of the mother's gotra was never a popular rule in the Brahmin community. It was observed by a small fraction of the population. Most of the commentators and the Nibandha-writers had expressed the opinion that only the Mādhyandina Brahmins should avoid the mother's gotra. In the face of these facts Kamalākara insists that the mother's gotra in addition to the father's should be avoided in marriage. We may conclude, therefore, that the idealistic rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy, as laid down in the Nirṇaya-Sindhu, was far from being actually practised by the people. Kamalākara prescribes the same penance for sapiṇḍa marriage as he has prescribed for sagotra marriage.[18] The wife is to be abandoned as far as sexual life is concerned, and three Lunar penances are to be performed. If the marriage is wilful and if it has proved productive, the issue will be a Chāṇḍāla. From these remarks of Kamalākara it will not be justifiable to argue that marriages in the third generation and onward were generally considered invalid in the seventeenth century. Whether Kamalākara himself considered marriage in the third or fourth generation illegal is a doubtful question. He has composed several verses to enumerate the Brahmins that should not be fed on the occasion of a Śrāddha feast. In the list of Brahmins unfit to be fed at a Śrāddha that he has prepared, he includes Kuṇḍa and Golaka both of whom are products of adultery, younger brother anticipating his elder brother and the elder brother

---

18 Nirṇayasindhu, p. 332.

so superseded etc.[19] In these verses a person who violates the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy is not mentioned. In continuation of the same discussion, however, Kamalākara quotes Jātūkarṇya to the following effect. "A Brahmin should not attend that Śrāddha function where a Brahmin, marrying the daughter of his maternal uncle or the husband of a Vṛishalī is present or where meat is not provided.[20]" Here, Jātūkarṇya considers a person, marrying his maternal uncle's daughter, unfit for being invited for a Śrāddha. We may reasonably infer from this that a person, marrying in the fourth generation, would not have been regarded unfit for Śrāddha either by Jātūkarṇya or by Kamalākara.

In Vīramitrodaya, Mitramiśra maintains the same extreme view of sapiṇḍa exogamy as is held by Kamalākara. Mitramiśra would not approve of marriage with the maternal uncle's daughter even in the Deccan. In Saṁskāra-Kaustubha, Anantadeva first states the traditional view of sāpiṇḍya; but he observes at the same time, wherever local custom sanctions marriage in the third generation, such marriage must be considered valid, and there can be no objection for others to associate with persons who narrow down limits of sāpiṇḍya. Several venerable men who themselves do not marry within the prohibited degrees are seen accepting brides from those who have more than once contracted marriage within the prohibited degrees. Hemādri opines that people marrying in the third generation should not be fed on the occasion of Śrāddha. Anantadeva declares that the above rule of Hemādri should apply to those persons who marry their cousins in places where the local custom does not sanction such

19 Nirṇayasindhu, p. 438.

20 Nirṇayasindhu, p. 440.

unions.[21] The author of Kaustubha was a Deccani Brahmin by caste, but he finished his work in Northern India. These two facts will explain his attitude towards sapiṇḍa exogamy. He does not support the contraction of the limits of sāpiṇḍya on principle. But he supports it wherever it is in accordance with the established practice.

Anantabhaṭṭa, the writer of Vidhāna–Pārijāta, wrote his work at Benares; and so he is an advocate of full sapiṇḍa exogamy. He is, however, ready to condone marriage in the third generation current in the Deccan.[22]

Dharma-Sindhu, a work composed at the close of the eighteenth century, is the latest authoritative work on Dharma-Śāstra as far as Mahārāshṭra is concerned. Kāśīnātha, the author, is generally a follower of Nirṇaya–Sindhu. On the question of exogamy, although he states prominently the views of Kamalākara, he thereafter proceeds to state different opinions held by various writers and finally concludes that, where local custom allows the narrowing-down of the limits of sāpiṇḍya, marriage in the third generation is not a sin. Kāśīnātha, being a member of the Karhāḍā Brahmin community of the Deccan in which the practice of marrying one's maternal uncle's daughter is current, naturally prescribes no penance for the breach of the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy. Dharma–Sindhu prohibits Viruddha–sambandha i. e. unequal marriage. Thus, marriage with one's wife's sister's daughter is a Viruddha–sambandha, and so is the marriage with one's paternaluncle's wife's sister. Both the above females are not one's sapiṇḍa; but from the point of generation the former is like his daughter, while the latter is in the place of uncle's wife. [23]

21 Saṁskāra-Kaustubha, p. 621.
22 Vidhāna-Pārijāta, Vol. I. pp. 688-698.
23 Dharma-Sindhu, III. p 130.

Recapitulation

I have so far stated the history of sapiṇḍa exogamy from the early Vedic times down to the eighteenth century. We have seen that in early Vedic times marriage was arranged outside the family, and thus some generations of agnates were avoided in marriage; but people could marry their cognates in the third generation. In Brāhmaṇa times gotra exogamy was, in all probability, introduced, and thus a number of agnatic generations began to be excluded in marriage; but cognates could still intermarry in the third or fourth generation. Manu who seems to be the most ancient law-giver among the Indo-Aryans enunciates both the aspects of exogamy—gotra exogamy as well as sapiṇḍa exogamy. How many cognatic generations are to be avoided according to Manu, we cannot definitely say. Manu defines sāpiṇḍya in two places in two different ways. In one place he defines it as extending over seven generations (Manu V–60); while in another place he defines it to cover only three generations (Manu IX–186). I have shown that the second definition is the more ancient definition. Manu, therefore, in all probability prohibited marriage in the third generation and did not object to it in the fourth generation and onward. Among Sūtra-writers Gautama would allow marriage in the eighth and sixth generations from the father's and the mother's side. Baudhāyana and Āpastamba do not define the limits of sāpiṇḍya to be observed in marriage, but probably they followed Manu. Baudhāyana refers to marriage in the third generation current in the Deccan, and condones it on the authority of local custom. So, it seems that in Baudhāyana's times marriage in the third generation was definitely stopped in Northern India, while the Southerner did marry in the third generation. Gautama allows marriage in the eighth and sixth generations from the father's and the mother's

side; while Vasishtha allows it one generation earlier in both cases. Yājñavalkya, Vishṇu and Nārada follow Vasishtha. Parāśara-Smṛiti does not deal with the problem of marriage. None of the above writers except Gautama prescribes any penance for sapiṇḍa marriage, although many of them have prescribed penance for sagotra marriage. In describing incestuous connections all writers condemn connections with sapiṇḍa relations in the second generation; but connection between sapiṇḍa relations in general is not regarded incestuous. It may be reasonably inferred from this that, although the legislators insisted on the avoidance of seven generations on the father's side and five on the mother's, their preaching was not rigidly followed by the people. The Southerners, in spite of anything that might have been said by Manu and Gautama, never ceased marrying in the third generation. In the Deccan the Draviḍa and Ādi-Draviḍa races formed the largest portion of the population, while the Indo-Aryans constituted a small minority. The Draviḍas, although they observed strict sept exogamy, had no highly developed sapiṇḍa exogamy as will be evident from the discussion in the sequel. Sapiṇḍa exogamy, prohibiting marriage in the second generation, has no practical value; and the Draviḍa had no objection to marry in the third generation as far as the cross-cousins were concerned. The Indo-Aryans also married in the third generation in Vedic times; and it was late that they began to develop sapiṇḍa exogamy. The promulgators of sapiṇḍa exogamy were to a considerable extent successful in the North, but in the Deccan people accepted the creed of sapiṇḍa exogamy only partially. In Northern India marriage in the third generation was stopped; but even there, beyond the third generation progress of sapiṇḍa exogamy was slow and uncertain. The stubborn attitude of the Deccani writers on this problem could not but adversely influence

the progress of sapiṇḍa exogamy in the North. Thus, although Smṛiti-writers enjoined the avoidance of seven and five generations from the father's and the mother's side, even the Northerners did not always quite faithfully follow the injunctions of the legislators. Under such circumstances the Smṛitis would not and could not penalize a sapiṇḍa marriage.

From the eighth century onward great commentators like Viśvarūpa, Medhātithi, Aparārka and Vijñāneśvara tried to give a fresh stimulus to sapiṇḍa exogamy. All of them accepted the definition of sāpiṇḍya as stated by Gautama, and thus they allowed marriage only in the eighth and sixth generations. All the four commentators speak against the breach of the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy; but as an illustration of the breach of that rule, they quote verses, condemning marriage in the third generation and not condemning sapiṇḍa marriage in general. Viśvarūpa, as a matter of fact, does sanction marriage in the fourth generation in the case of the Kshatriyas and Vaiśyas. Aparārka and Vijñāneśvara also quote Paiṭhīnasi and Chaturviṁśati-mata that advocate narrowing-down the limits of sāpiṇḍya, but they opine that these texts from Paiṭhīnasi and Chaturviṁśati-mata have only a limited application. On the whole, on reading the original texts of Smṛitis as well as the commentaries on them, one is inclined to think that, though marriage in the third generation was definitely stopped in Northern India, if a person married beyond the third generation but within the prohibited degrees the marriage was not considered invalid. It may be that marriages within the prohibited degrees were rather rare. Two eminent Deccani writers, Devaṇa and Mādhava, defended marriage in the third generation not on the authority of local custom but on principle. In the Brāhma form of marriage

a woman, as soon as she is married, loses her father's gotra as well as her father's sapiṇḍa relationship and acquires those of her husband. The powerful advocacy of marriage in the third generation by these two Deccani pandits shattered the hopes of the Northern writers to force their rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy on the Deccan. Aparārka and Vijñāneśvara were the natives of Deccan; but they stood by the extensive sapiṇḍa exogamy preached by the Northern writers. On the other hand, the writings of Devaṇa and Mādhava not only created a profound and lasting impression on the minds of the Deccanis, but must have, though perhaps not so markedly, softened down the rigidity of sapiṇḍa exogamy also in Northern India. Raghunandana, a Bengali writer, tried to extend sapiṇḍa exogamy further than was ever contemplated by any previous writer. He declared that five and seven generations to be avoided in marriage should be counted from the bandhus of the mother and the father. This extension was qualified by a proviso that a girl within the prohibited degrees may be accepted if she is beyond three gotras. This development of sapiṇḍa exogamy does not seem to have been favourably received by the people. Kamalākara adopts the extensive view of sapiṇḍa exogamy, but does not so much emphasise it; because in his calculation of 2121 unmarriageable girls he does not take into consideration the sapiṇḍa relationship counted from the bandhus. Madana-Pārijāta and Nirṇaya-Sindhu are the only two prominent Nibandhas that condemn sagotra and sapiṇḍa marriage alike in clear terms. But even from the Nirṇaya-Sindhu it is not quite clear whether sapiṇḍa marriage was actually invalid, because in describing the Brahmins, unfit for participating in a Śrāddha dinner on the authority of Jātūkarṇya, he mentions only the person who marries

his maternal uncle's daughter and not a person marrying within the prohibited degrees in general. From this particular reference to marriage in the third generation, we may reasonably think that marriage in the fourth generation and onward was not quite invalid according to Kamalākara. Nirṇaya-Sindhu was written at Benares, and Kamalākara's family, though it hailed from the Deccan, was naturalized in Northern India during some generations. If Kamalākara does not regard marriage in the fourth generation and onward invalid, it may be considered as the current and the accepted opinion in the seventeenth century in the Northern India. I have already made it clear that by saying, "Marriage in the fourth generation is not regarded invalid by most of the ancient and modern writers," I do not mean to suggest that marriages in the fourth generation were frequent in Northern India. What I want to point out is that for various reasons sapiṇḍa exogamy never attained the rigidity of gotra exogamy even in Northern India; while in Southern India it could hardly make any marked progress; because marriage with maternal uncle's daughter and paternal aunt's daughter had been and is still current in the South. The actual practices of the people go even beyond this; and in the Carnatic a man marries his elder sister's daughter.[24] In other words a member of the second generation marries his sapiṇḍa relation in the third generation. In the Deccan it is only the Chitpāvan Bramhins and the Yajurvedī Mādhyandina Brahmins that do not marry in the third generation; but even with the Chitpāvans as far as my information goes, marriage in the fourth generation and onward is not considered invalid. Mother's sister's daughter who is the sapiṇḍa relation in the third generation is regarded unmarriageable both by the Northerners

24 Gore, "Vaidika-Vivāha-Paddhati," p. 12.

and the Southerners. Marriage with maternal uncle's daughter is far more frequent than that with father's sister's daughter.

Before beginning the next chapter I should like to compare the restrictions of the sapiṇḍa exogamy of the Indo-Aryans with the restrictions prevalent among some other peoples of the world. Gurudas Banerjee in this connection observes, " The prohibited degrees in the case of the collaterals extend much further in the above rules (of the Indo-Aryan sapiṇḍa exogamy) than they do in other systems such as the Jewish, the Roman, the English, the French and the Mohamedan. In none of these does the prohibition of marriage between collaterals extend further than to marriage between brother and sister, uncle and niece, aunt and nephew, and great-aunt and grand-nephew. In the direct line marriage is prohibited between descendants and ascendants in all these systems. " This prohibition is not to be found in the Hindu law. But the rules of the sapiṇḍa exogamy of the Hindus emdody such prohibitions to an extent which is sufficient for all practical purposes.[25] Banerjee points out that by prohibiting marriage in seven generations of ascendants and descendants, Hindu Law has made marriage between ascendants and descendants practically impossible. I fail to see, however, how the rules of sapiṇḍa exogamy achieve the end of prohibiting marriage between ascendants and descendants. Sapiṇḍa relationship ceases according to the idealistic view, in the sixth generation from the mother's side and in the eighth from the father's side. There is no rule in the Sūtras or in the Smṛitis that prohibits marriage between the eighth person from the father's side and the sixth from the mother's side. On the other hand, there are Smṛiti-texts that recognize mar-

25 Banerjee, p. 68.

riage between unequal generations. The following text, quoted in the Dharma-Sindhu, is pertinent on this point: "The fourth and the fifth male should marry the fourth girl. In the opinion of Parāśara the fifth male should marry the sixth girl, but never the fifth girl. One should marry a girl beyond the seventh generation; in her absence, a girl in the seventh generation, or a girl in the fifth generation. On the father's side also, the same course should be followed." [26] Thus, it will be seen that many old writers of Dharma-Śāstra never contemplated to prohibit unequal marriage i. e. marriage between ascendant and descendant. It is only in few places that an unequal marriage is condemned. Marriage between unequal generations is called 'Viruddha-sambandha' in Sanskrit. In the appendix to the Āśvalāyana-Gṛihya-Sūtra 'Viruddha-sambandha' is condemned. The text of Āśvalāyana has been quoted in Nirṇaya-Sindhu,[27] Saṁskāra-Kaustubha[28] and Dharma-Sindhu.[29] In the appendix to Āśvalāyana-Gṛihya-Sūtra, the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy and the rule about Viruddha-sambandha are given side by side, thus showing that the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy by itself does not prohibit marriage between unequal generations. From the fact that only a few writers condemned Viruddha-sambandha, we may reasonably conclude that Hindu Law-givers are not very particular on the point of unequal marriage. As regards the other branches of the Aryan race, with the Greeks forbidden degrees were very few; and they did practise unequal marriages. Greek history records a marriage between aunt and

26 Dharma-Sindhu, III. p. 127.
27 Nirṇayasindhu, p. 318.
28 Saṁskāra-Kaustubha (Nirṇaya-Sāgar edition), p. 698.
29 Dharma-Sindhu, III. p. 130.

nephew in the family of Demosthenes.[30] Among the Romans, originally cognates could not marry within seven generations (The generations were to be counted according to the Roman method), or in other words, second cousins could not intermarry; but later on the limit was narrowed down to three generations i. e. even first cousins could intermarry.[31] The inbreeding of the Iranians was notorious, and it has been exhaustively dealt with above. Marriage with deceased wife's sister is permitted under the rules of the Indo-Aryan sapiṇḍa exogamy. The matter can be stretched further. As polygamy is sanctioned both by Śrutis and Smṛitis, a man may have two or three sisters for his wives simultaneously, though from the point of decency marriage ceremonies may take place at different times.[32] The Canon Law of the English Church prohibits marriage with the deceased wife's sister; but civil law allows it, though the clergymen having conscientious scruples are exempted from celebrating such marriages.[33]

---

30. W. J. Woodhouse, in "Ency. of Religion & Ethics,"(1915), Vol. 8, p. 445.
31 W. Warde Fowler, in " Ency. of Religion & Ethics, " Vol. 8, p. 464.
32 Mandlik, " Vyavahāra--Mayūkha," p. 415.
33 W. M. Foley, in "Ency. of Religion & Ethics," Vol. 8, p. 442.

CHAPTER XI

Exogamy among the Non-Brahmins

What has been said until now regarding gotra and sapiṇḍa exogamy mainly applies to Brahmins and other high class Hindus who may be styled 'people of Sanskritic culture.' Lower castes of the Hindus and the unalloyed aboriginal tribes who may collectively be called 'people of Non-Aryan culture' have their own rules of sept and sapiṇḍa exogamy. Even among the people of Sanskritic culture, rules of exogamy, explained so far, have not a uniform application. Each caste has made suitable modifications in the rules in making them applicable to itself. Although caste was rather elastic in the early Vedic times, the hereditary Brahmin caste was gradually formed; and it was zealous to establish its supremacy over the other castes. Brāhmaṇa works are full of evidence of the efforts of the Brahmins to parade their supremacy over the Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas. In the early stages of the Indo-Aryan settlement in India when hard fighting had to be made against the aborigines for every inch of ground to be gained, it was quite natural that the Indo-Aryans comprising the three classes formed a homogeneous group. As long as the conquerors were not firmly established on the new land, the question of the superiority or inferiority of the classes or castes did not arise. But the aboriginal races were slowly vanquished or humbled down, and the Indo-Aryans could pursue peaceful occupations. The Brahmin class who did all the priestly work henceforth tried to differentiate between themselves and the other two classes. The priestly class was gradually made hereditary, and admission into the Brahmin-fold slowly grew next to impossible. In every ceremonial, distinction was made between the treatment to be awarded to the Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas on one

hand, and the Brahmins on the other hand. In order to justify these distinctions and the special privileges of the Brahmin caste, it was necessary to invent a pedigree for the Brahmins. The pedigree was supplied by the pravara system under which the whole Brahmin community was organized into ten divisions (gaṇas). The Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas were deliberately excluded from this organization; and they were asked to borrow the pravaras of their priests. Brahmins claimed descent from the pravara Ṛishis; and to show that this claim was not fictitious they based their sept exogamy upon pravaras. As the Brahmin aspired to be the supreme spiritual leader of the whole Indian population, it was natural that he should try to outdo all in the rigidity of his social life. With this double purpose in view the Brahmins adopted the most comprehensive form of sept exogamy and sapiṇḍa exogamy. The Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas, although they were not included in the pravara and gotra organization of the Brahmins, did not readily submit to this humiliation, and some of them claimed gotras after the fashion of the Brahmins. The gotras of the Kshatriyas and the Vaiśyas were in some cases borrowed from the family priests; and in other cases, they, in the vain imitation of the Brahmanical gotras, appropriated fictitious names for their gotra Ṛishis. A large portion of the Kshatriya and the Vaiśya population who did not aspire after the Brahmanical gotras contented themselves with assuming the names of illustrious historical personages and sometimes the names of fictitious personages for their gotras. But from another point of view the Kshatriya and the Vaiśya castes have really surpassed the Brahmins. In certain parts of Northern India high-class non-Brahmins prohibit marriage in the gotra both of the father and the mother. And in some cases the prohibition is extended to four, seven

and even nine gotras;[1] while the Brahmins as a rule avoid only the father's gotra, and very rarely the mother's gotra. Exogamy of the mixed castes is generally based on territorial divisions. Exogamous septs are sometimes named after titles or nicknames. Non-Aryan tribes are as a rule divided into exogamous septs of the totemic origin. In certain castes there are no regular septs beyond the surnames or family names. In some cases the rule of exogamy does not go beyond avoiding certain prohibited degrees. To the above five classes of exogamous divisions mentioned by Risley the name of one more class must be added. Some sub-castes of the Gonds and other allied Dravidian tribes in the Central Provinces base their exogamy upon the number of the gods that each man worships. Marriage between persons worshipping the same number of gods is barred. Besides the rule of sept exogamy, the Indo-Aryans, non-Aryans and the people of mixed culture, all follow some rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy —the rule of prohibited degrees. I propose in this chapter briefly to deal with the rules of sept and sapiṇḍa exogamy as practised by the principal Hindu castes of the Aryan, non-Aryan and mixed origins. As I have exhaustively dealt with the exogamy of the Brahmins, I shall not include the Brahmins in the list of castes with whose exogamy I shall concern myself hereafter. With the addition of the exogamous division based upon the number of gods that each person worships, I have adopted the classes of exogamous divisions as given by Risley.[2] It often happens that the same caste has exogamous divisions of different types in different provinces, and sometimes even in the same province at different places. In classifying the exogamous divisions of such castes I have

1 Risley, I. p. 285.

2 "People of India," (1908). p. 155.

given preference to the most important type; but at the same time I have mentioned the other types of exogamous divisions that are found in the caste.

-: o :-

(1) Eponymous Divisions

These divisions are formed in the names of some Vedic Ṛishis or some great heroes of ancient or modern date, either real or mythical.

(1) Agarwāla is a sub-caste of the great Banya caste. They claim Brahmanical gotras. According to a legend, Raja Agrasena had eighteen queens. He determined to perform a great sacrifice with each of his queens. Each of these sacrifices was in charge of an officiating priest. The gotras which sprang from Agrasena are named after the eighteen priests. The eighteenth sacrifice was left unfinished, and so there are seventeen and half gotras and not eighteen. The names of these gotras as given by Messrs. Risley, Sherring and Crooke materially differ from each other.[1] Exogamy among the Agarwāla is based on these gotras, each gotra being an exogamous unit. Gotra exogamy is supplemented by the usual rule of Brahmin sapiṇḍa exogamy and the avoidance of the mother's gotra.[2]

(2) Baidya is a highly respected caste found only in Bengal proper. Their features and complexion are well indicative of their comparatively pure Aryan descent. Their exogamous groups are eponymous, the eponyms being Vedic Ṛishis or saints. They follow the same rules of exogamy as are followed by the Brahmins.[3]

1 Crooke, I. pp. 15-16.

2 Crooke, I. p. 19.

3 Risley, I. pp. 46-47.

(3) Baniyas—Most of the Baniya sub-castes have an elaborate system of exogamy. They are split up into a large number of sections or into few gotras each of which is further divided into sub-sections. Marriage is regulated by forbidding a man to take a wife from the whole of his section and from the sub-section of his mother, grandmothers and even great grandmothers. Thus, marriage of persons within five or more degrees of relationship either through male or female is barred. The gotras are named after the Brahmin Ṛishis or saints.[4]

(4) Bhātiyas are an undisputed Rajput caste that exclusively followed the commercial pursuits. In Sind and Gujrat they form the leading commercial race. They have Brahmanical gotras, but their exogamy is not based on these gotras. Each gotra is subdivided into several Nukhs. The Nukhs are designated after some person, village or occupation, such as Nukh Rāe Haria from Rāe Harisingh, Rāe Gajaria after the village Gajaria, and Rāe Tāmbol after a Tāmboli or seller of betel. A man may marry a girl of his own gotra but not of his own Nukh. Some generations on the father's side and the mother's side are also avoided though the exact number of generations is not settled.[5]

(5) Some sub-castes of the Bhāts—the family bards—claim Brahmanical gotras, and their exogamy is based upon these gotras. They follow the standard formula of exogamy as in the case of higher castes.[6]

(6) Brahma Kshatri, a caste chiefly found in Ahmedabad, Surat, Broach and Kathiawar, has the same gotras as the Brahmins; and the rules of sept and sapiṇḍa exogamy are also the same as are followed by the Brahmins.[7]

4 Russell, II. p. 121.
5 Crooke, II. pp. 40, 41.
6 Crooke, II. pp. 23-24.
7 Enthoven, I. p. 209.

(7) Kammālans are the Tamil artizan castes of the Madras Presidency. They are divided into five occupational sections—goldsmith, brass-smith, carpenter, stone-mason and blacksmith. These five artizan classes are sometimes known by the common name Pāñchāla. The Pāñchālas claim to be Brahmins and have adopted five Brahmanical gotras called Visvagu, Janagha, Ahima, Janārdana and Ubhendra. Each of these gotras is said to have twenty-five sub-gotras. The sub-sections are hardly ever known to the common members of the community. They follow the rules of Brahmanical gotra exogamy.[8]

(8) Karan is the indigenous writer-caste of Orissa. Most of the exogamous divisions of the Karans are of the standard Brahmanical type. They follow the usual rules of exogamy current in high class Hindus with the only exception that a man may marry his maternal uncle's daughter which is strictly forbidden by the ordinary rules.[9]

(9) Kāyastha Prabhu is the writer-class of the Marāthā country. Prabhus have eponymous gotras like the Brahmins. In most cases they are identical. They follow the Brahmanical rule of exogamy. They do not, however, claim descent from the Ṛishis, but simply the discipleship of particular Ṛishis.[10]

(10) The Khatris of Canara have two exogamous gotras, Bharadvāja and Kaśyapa. They have no surnames.[11]

(11) Khyāns are a trading caste of Northern Bengal and Assam. They have exogamous sections of the ordinary Brahmanical type. They may not marry in their

8 Thurston, III. p. 108. 9 Risley, I. p. 425.

10 Enthoven, III. p. 245; Russell, IV. p, 399.

11 Enthoven, II. p. 215.

own gotra. In addition to this they follow the usual formula of prohibited degrees.[12]

(12) Lambādis are a well-known tribe of carriers that is found all over Western and Southern India. They have several exogamous septs which are of the eponymous type.[13]

(13) Lingāyats are spread over S.M. Country, Hyderabad, Mysore and North Western Districts of Madras. In the higher ranks of the Lingāyats the exogamous septs are named after the five Lingāyat sages—an imitation of Brahmanical gotras. The Lingāyat eponymous sages are Nundi, Bhṛingi, Vīra, Vṛisha and Skanda. Children of two brothers or two sisters cannot intermarry. A man may not marry his younger sister's daughter.[14]

(14) Māli is a garland-making caste of Bengal and Behar. Mālis are ranked Śūdras, but curiously enough, some of their sub-castes claim Brahmanical gotras such as Kaśyapa, Mudgala, Śāṇḍilya etc.; and they follow the Brahmanical rule of gotra exogamy and sapiṇḍa exogamy.[15]

(15) Mūssads are residents of Travancore and Cochin. They follow the Nambūtiris in their marriage customs. Only the eldest male member in the family can marry. Others have to fall into illicit connection. The Mūssads regulate their marriage with the usual Brahmanical gotras.[16]

(16) Nambūtiri Brahmins are a land-owning Brahmin caste of Malbar. They have many peculiar features of their own. Only the oldest male member in the family can marry; others must remain satisfied with illicit connections. Like all other Brahmins the Nambūtiris have

---

12 Risley, I. p. 489. 13 Thurston, IV. p. 209.
14 Enthoven, II. p. 356. 15 Risley, II. p, 60
16 Thurston, V. p. 123.

eponymous gotras. Some of the main gotras of the Nambūtiris are unusual and are not found in other sections of Brahmins. Kamasha and Tatri may serve as examples.[17]

(17) The Nāyars were originally a military caste; but now-a-days they are engaged in all sorts of pursuits. The Nāyars follow matrilineal descent. The descendants of any female ancestor cannot intermarry. The Nāyars are divided into Tārvāds i.e. families whose relationship is only traditional. According to the Nāyar ideas the most proper bride for a man is the daughter of his maternal uncle.[18]

(18) Pānchakalsi, a Bombay caste, regulates marriage by the Brahmanical gotras which they do not claim by way of descent, but only by the right of discipleship. A man may not marry his father's sister's daughter, but he can marry his maternal uncle's daughter.[19]

(19) Pāthāre Prabhus regulate their marriage by their eponymous gotras. Marriage between sisters' children is barred; so also marriage between sister's daughter and brother's son is barred.[20]

(20) Rajput is the warrior-caste of Northern India. Their total population in India is about nine millions. The Rajputs are spread over the Punjab, Rajputana, U.P. and C.P. There are thirty-six traditional divisions of the Rajputs. But these thirty-six divisions have been long since antiquated. Several of the traditional thirty-six clans are extinct, and many new clans have crept in. It has happened in certain cases that the original clan has been sud-divided into branches which have risen to such eminence that old clan name is entirely lost

17 Thurston, V. p. 196.

18 Iyer, "The Cochin Tribes and Castes," Vol. II. pp. 21-22.

19 Enthoven, III. p. 162. 20 Enthoven, III. p. 250.

sight of. Besides the subdivisions of the clans, the Rajputs have eponymous gotras exactly after the Brahmin model. Theoretically marriage is prohibited in the whole clan; thus, the Brahmin gotra must not play any part in the application of the rule of exogamy. But according to Risley, different branches of the same clan sometimes intermarry. In Central Provinces several clans have developed into endogamous castes; and the endogamous castes regulate their marriages by eponymous septs. Mr. Crooke is of opinion that in U.P. the clans of the Rajputs constitute their exogamous units.[21] The original septs of the Rajput tribe appear to be of the territorial type i.e. their names seem to denote the country in which the sept or its founder originally lived. The modern tendency of the Rajputs is, however, to accept the Brahmanical gotras in preference to the territorial septs. Where the Brahmanical gotras have superseded the territorial septs, the Rajputs follow the usual rule of gotra and sapiṇḍa exogamy. But where the original sept names still govern intermarriage, a Rajput excludes his own sept, mother's sept and often times the septs of his maternal and paternal grandmothers.[22]

(21) Sembadavans are a fisherman caste of the Tamil country. Their exogamous septs are named after their heroes.[23]

(22) Suraj-bansi is the name that is very recently assumed by a hybrid Mongoloid tribe. With the encouragement of the Srotriya Brahmins, Suraj-bansis adopted in 1871 the Brahmanical gotras, and marriage within the Brahmanical gotra is now strictly forbidden.[24]

21 Russell, IV. p. 418. 22 Risley, II. p. 186.
23 Thurston, VI. p. 353. 24 Risley, II. p. 285.

(23) Taga is an important cultivating and land-owning tribe confined to the Ganges-Jumna-Duab. They have exogamous groups framed on the Brahmin or Kshatriya model.[25]

-- :o :---

Totemic Divisions

For some thousand years the non-Aryan tribes in India are being gradually Hinduised or rather Brahmanized. As a result of this, there are very few castes and tribes in India to-day that can completely satisfy the various tests of a real totemic life. I should like to state, therefore, at the outset that in the following list totemic names of septs are there; but one may not expect to find corresponding totemic superstitions in each case.

(1) Agària, a Dravidian tribe, is found in Mirzapur. It has seven totemic septs. Vulture, tortoise, Palāśa (name of a tree) are some of the septs. Marriage is prohibited in the sept. The rule is not supplemented by any rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy.[1]

(2) Aiyarakulu is a caste of Telgu cultivators. They are divided into totemic gotras which are not exogamous. The totemic gotras are further subdivided into exogamous septs called Intiperulus. The custom of Menarikam by which a man marries his maternal uncle's daughter by right is observed.[2]

(3) Badagas are the agricultural class of the Nilgiris. The Badagas have exogamous septs or kuls of which Māri, Madhava (marriage), Kastūri (musk), Belli (silver) are examples.[3]

---

25 Crooke, IV. p. 354.

1 Crooke, I. pp. 2—3. 2 Thurston, I. p. 20.

3 Thurston, I. p. 75.

(4) Bāgdi is a cultivating, fishing and menial caste of Central and Western Bengal. They seem to be of Dravidian origin. In Western districts they have totemic septs which are exogamous; while in 24-Parganas, they have adopted the Brahmanical gotras and have based their exogamy upon these gotras. Their totemic superstitions are not yet quite extinct. They follow the Brahmanical rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy.[4]

(5) Baliga is the chief Telgu trading caste, spread all over the Madras presidency. Baligas have septs and gotras of which the former are exogamous. The septs are clearly of the totemic type. The following are few of their septs: Puli—tiger, Balli—lizard, Nemili—peacock, Nārikella—coconut, etc.[5]

(6) Bant is the chief cultivating and land-owning caste of S. Canara. The Bants are divided into a number of Balis (septs) which are exogamous. The Balis are traced in the female line. Persons belonging to same Bali cannot intermarry, and the prohibition extends to certain allied Balis. A man cannot marry his father's brother's daughter though she belongs to a different Bali. A few of their Balis are as follows: ashes, scorpion, tiger fowl, green peas, etc.[6]

(7) Bāvuri is a low caste of Uria basket-makers. They have totemic septs which are exogamous. A man may marry his maternal uncle's daughter, but not his paternal aunt's daughter.[7]

(8) Bedar or Boya is a hunting and labouring caste of Madras. They are divided into exogamous septs which

4 Risley, I. p. 38. 5 Thurston, I. p. 141.
6 Thurston, I. p. 164. 7 Thurston, I. pp. 176-177.

from their names appear to be of the totemic type. A few of their septs are as follows: pig, peacock, cow, rays, bread, locust, charcoal, army, plough, light, garden, hut, fire, drum, fort etc.[8]

(9) Bestha is a fishing and hunting Telgu caste. They have totemic septs which are exogamous.[9]

(10) Bhandāri is a sea-faring caste of Bombay. They are divided into kuls which are exogamous. The kuls are named after the Devaks such as pīpal, kadamba, umber and mango which each family worships. The Devaks are held in great respect. In certain places Devak is no longer considered an exogamous unit, and persons of the same Devak may intermarry, provided they belong to different surnames. The rule of prohibited degrees bars marriage within three generations on the father's and mother's side. The Bhandāris now-a-days have begun to claim Brahmanical gotras; but there will be a considerable time hereafter, before their marriages are regulated by their newly-assumed Brahmanical gotras.[10]

(11) Bhil is a non-Aryan tribe of Central India, Rajputana, Khandesh and C.P. Their total population is not less than a million. The Bhils are divided into septs which are named after plants and animals. A man must not marry in his own sept nor in the families of his mother and grandmother. The union of first cousins is thus prohibited. The rule of prohibited degrees does not prevail among the Bhils.[11]

(12) Bhoi is the caste of litter-bearers. In Khandesh they have exogamous septs named after different trees. The septs are called Devaks. The system of

8 Thurston, I. pp. 198-199. 9 Thurston, I. 221.
10 Enthoven, I. p. 99. 11 Russell, II. p. 287.

Devaks or totems is being slowly supplanted by the more advanced system of prohibiting marriage between members bearing the same surname; and in some cases even the Brahmanical gotras are coming into prominence; but it is very doubtful whether these Brahmanical gotras in any way regulate the marriages of the Bhois.[12]

(13) Bhondāri is the barber-caste of the Oria country. They have totemic septs such as Mohiro (peacock), Dhippo (light), Nāgasira (cobra). The septs are exogamous. A man must not marry in his own sept. Besides, he cannot marry his maternal uncle's and paternal aunt's daughters.[13]

(14) Billava is a Tulu-speaking caste of toddy-drawers. They have exogamous Balis like the Bants.[14]

(15) Bottada is a caste of Uria cultivators. They have totemic septs which are exogamous.[15]

(16) Chasa is the chief cultivating caste of Orissa. Each Chasa family has a gota or sept, and a Varga or a family name. Gotas are few; Vargas are numerous. Gotas are totemic. Marriage is prohibited within the same Varga, but not within the gota.[16]

(17) Chenchu is a Telgu-speaking jungle tribe inhabiting the hills of Nellore District. The Chenchus are divided into exogamous septs which are of the totemic type. The following are some of the typical septs—Gurram (horse), Arati (plantain-tree), Tota (garden), Mekala (goat) and Gundam (pit).[17]

(18) Chero is a Dravidian tribe of U.P., Behar and Chota Nagpur. They are divided into totemic gotas or

---

12 Enthoven, I. p. 182.
13 Thurston, I. pp. 231-232.
14 Thurston, I. pp. 246-247.
15 Thurston, I. p. 265.
16 Russell, II. p. 425.
17 Thurston, II. p. 39.

septs which are exogamous, but as to the prohibited degrees, those Cheroes who are still true to their traditions forbid marriage only with the first cousin on the father's side. But marriage of cousins on the mother's side is permitted. On the other hand, the more Hinduised Cheroes observe entire rule of Brahmin sapiṇḍa exogamy which bars the line of the paternal uncle, maternal uncle, paternal aunt and maternal aunt.[18]

(19) Dandāsi is the village-watchman in Ganjam district. They have totemic septs which are exogamous. Marriage in the sept is prohibited. A man may marry his maternal uncle's daughter, but not the paternal aunt's daughter.[19]

(20) Devānga is a caste of weavers, speaking Telgu and Canarese Languages. Devāngas have totemic exogamous septs, such as knife, grain, rock, cart, butter, milk, red sky, boat, bird, etc.[20]

(21) Devār is a Dravidian caste of beggars and musicians. They are divided into totemic groups which are exogamous. Marriage within the gotra is forbidden, but there is no rule barring the mating of near cognates.[21]

(22) Dhangar is a caste of shepherds found principally in C.P. and Central India. They are described as of mixed origin. Their exogamous septs are totemic. Marriage in one's own gota and mother's gota is prohibited. The prohibited degrees of relationship do not, however, go beyond the first cousin.[22]

(23) Dhanwār is a primitive tribe, living in the hilly country adjoining Chota Nagpur. They are divided into

18 Crooke, II. p. 217. 19 Thurston, II. pp. 107-109.
20 Thurston, II. p. 160. 21 Russell, II. p. 474.
22 Russell, II. p. 481.

a number of totemic exogamous septs. Many of the septs are the names of plants and animals. Marriage in the sept is forbidden; and in addition, marriage between first cousins is also barred.[23]

(24) Dharkār is a sub-caste of Doms. They have totemic exogamous septs. Marriage in the sept is forbidden. The rule is supplemented by the prohibition of marriage in the maternal uncle's family and paternal aunt's family for three generations.[24]

(25) Dhīmar is the fisherman-caste of C.P. They have totemic or titular exogamous septs. Marriage within the sept as well as marriage between the first cousins is prohibited.[25]

(26) Dhor is the tanner-caste of Mahārāshṭra. They have surnames and totemic Devaks as well. The sameness of the surname as well as the Devak bars marriage. A man may marry his maternal uncle's daughter and his paternal aunt's daughter, but not the mother's sister's daughter.[26]

(27) Dhuniya is a cotton-carding caste of U.P. They have totemic septs, but exogamy is not based on these septs. Marriage is prohibited in the family of uncles and aunts on both the sides.[27]

(28) Gadaba is a tribe of agriculturists and coolies in the Vizagapattam district. The septs are totemic and exogamous. Kora (the sun), Nāg (cobra), Bhāg (tiger), Kīra (parrot) are some of the septs.[28]

(29) Gadariya, Gadba, Gārpagāri and Gauria are all castes, low in their social status. The exogamous

23 Russell, II. pp. 490-491. 24 Crooke, II. p. 279.
25 Russell, II. p. 504. 26 Enthoven, I. p. 337.
27 Crooke, II. p. 297. 28 Thurston, II. p. 247.

septs of these castes are mostly of the totemic type. Marriage in the sept is prohibited, but marriage between the children of the brothers and sisters is permissible.[29]

(30) Ghasiya is a Dravidian tribe in Mirzapur in U.P. It has retained a complete set of totemic septs. The number of the septs is seven. The septs are exogamous. The only additional rule of exogamy is that one cannot marry the child of his sister; but marriage with maternal uncle's children and father's sister's children is allowed.[30]

(31) Golla is a great pastoral caste of the Telgu people. The exogamous Intiperulus (septs) of the Gollas are as follows—fire, cow, tamarind, ear, stone, horse, dumb, jackal. Marriage in the sept is prohibited.[31]

(32) Gond is the principal family of the Dravidian tribe and the most important of the non-Aryan tribes. The Gond population is three millions strong in India, of which 2300000 are claimed by C.P., the remaining population being spread over Central India, Behar and Orissa equally. The Gond rule of exogamy in some cases seems to be similar to that found in Australia. The whole tribe is divided into two or four main divisions; and every man in one or two of them must marry a woman in the other one or two. For instance, the Māria Gonds are divided into two great divisions. There are ninety septs in the first division, and there are sixty-nine septs in the second division. All persons in the same division, in spite of their different septs, consider themselves Bhāibands i.e. brothers or cousins, and they cannot intermarry. Members of the first division can intermarry only with the members of the second division. The relationship between the first division and the second division is

29 Russell, III, pp. 1-26. 30 Crooke, II. p. 412.
31 Thurston, II. p. 291.

expressed by the word Māmābhai—a maternal uncle's son. When a sub-caste is thus divided into two main divisions, the septs, included in each division, play no part in regulating marriage.

The Muria Gonds of Bastar have a few exogamous septs named after animals and plants. The commonest totemic septs of the Gonds are Murkam (mango-tree), tekām (teak tree), Netām (dog) and so on. A man must not marry in his own sept nor in one which worships the same number of gods in those places where the Gonds are grouped together on the basis of the gods worshipped by them. Intermarriage between septs which stand to each other in the relationship of Bhāiband or brothers is also barred. Marriage of first cousins is specially favoured. Formerly marriage between brother's daughter and sister's son was most common; but now-a-days brother's son often marries the sister's daughter. In Mandla and Bastar a man claims by right the daughter of his sister for his son. In Mandla a man claims not only the daughter of his sister but even of his cousin. Children of two sisters cannot intermarry; and a man cannot marry his wife's elder sister, aunt or neice, his mother-in-law or her sister. Marriage between grandchildren and grandparents is not, however, prohibited. If an old man marries a young wife and dies, his grandson may take her for his wife, provided she is of suitable age. In Bastar, a man can marry his daughter's daughter or maternal grandfather's or grandmother's sister. If he cannot marry his son's daughter or paternal grandfather's sister, it is because they belong to the same sept as his own.[32]

(33) Gowāri is the grazier-caste of Marāthā countries corresponding to the Ahīrs. They are divided

32 Russell, III. pp. 64-72.

into exogamous sections of the totemic or titular type. Some sections do not intermarry, because they are believed to have descended from one mother in remote past and are called Dūdhbhāis. The usual rule of exogamy prohibits marriage within the sept or within the group of septs called Dūdbhāis—milk-brothers. Children of two sisters cannot intermarry. A man may marry his daughter to his sister's son, but not vice versa.[33]

(34) Gūdala is a Telgu caste of basket-makers of the Madras presidency. Gūldalas have totemic exogamous septs. They follow the custom of Menarikam.[34]

(35) Haddi is a low caste of Oriyas. They have totemic exogamous septs. They practise Menarikam.[35]

(36) Ho is a non-Aryan tribe of the district of Singbhum. It is divided into numerous totemic septs which are exogamous. A man on no account may marry a girl of his own sept. Their views on the subject of prohibited degrees are rather lax; and marriages with near relatives on mother's side are allowed; a man, however, cannot marry his aunt, his first cousin or his niece.[36]

(37) Holeya is a caste of field-labourers. The caste is found in South Canara. Holeyas are divided into Balis or exogamous septs, some of which are as follows :—elephant, garland, ant-hill, milk, honey, hare etc.[37]

(38) Jhādi Telenga is a small caste in Bastar state allied to the Gonds. Just like the Gonds, the Telengas are divided into two main divisions. Each division contains several totemic septs. A man from the first division can marry with a person of any sept in the second

33 Russell, III. pp. 161-162. 34 Thurston, II. p. 301.
35 Thurston, II. p. 319. 36 Risley, I. p. 320.
37 Thurston, II. p. 344.

division; but he cannot marry with any member in his own division although the individual septs be different.[38]

(39) Juāng is a non-Aryan tribe in Orissa. The caste is divided into totemic groups which are exogamous. A man may not marry in his own group. He must also observe certain rules of prohibited degrees which are not quite accurately defined.[39]

(40) Kālinji is the agricultural and cultivating caste of Vizagapattam. Like other Oriya castes, the Kālinjis have gotras such as Bāno (sun), Sukro (star), Sanko (conch-shell), Bhāgo (tiger), Nāgo (cobra) etc. All the gotras are not uniformly exogamous. For example, Sukro is an exogamous unit in certain places, while it is not so in other places.[40]

(41) Kamār is a small Dravidian tribe of C.P. They are divided into exogamous septs which are similar in names to those of the Gonds. Marriage in the sept is barred. But children of brothers and sisters may intermarry. Unlike the Gonds, however, children of two sisters are not barred from intermarrying.[41]

(42) Kamma is a Telgu agriculturist and trading caste of Madras. They seem to have been divided into exogamous septs of the totemic type, such as jasmine, dry field, wind, comb, musk, rice etc.[42]

(43) Kāpu or Reddi is the largest caste of the Madras Presidency. They are the cultivators and farmers of the Telgu country. Their exogamous septs are of the totemic type, such as cow, grain, cart, buffalo, sheep, army, elephant etc. Most of the totemic names have lost their totemic significance; but a few names are still cherished as real totems.[43]

38 Russell, III. p. 239. 39 Risley, I. p. 352.
40 Thurston, III. p. 50. 41 Russell, III. p. 324.
42 Thurston, III. p. 98. 43 Thurston, III. p. 231.

(44) Kawar is a primitive tribe living in the hills of Chhatisgarh. Their exogamous divisions which are numerous are of the totemic type. Not less than 117 totemic septs have been recorded and the list is not exhaustive. Broadly speaking every common animal or bird and even articles of food and dress have given their names to septs. Marriage within the sept is barred, and so between the children of brothers and sisters.[44]

(45) Khariyā is a Dravidian tribe of Chota Nagpur. The septs of the Khariyās are totemic in origin and are exogamous. A man may not marry a woman of his own sept. As regards other cognatic relations, the Khariyās do not seem to be anxious to exclude them in marriage. They content themselves with forbidding a man to marry his aunts, nieces and first cousins.[45]

(46) Komatis form a great trading caste of the Madras Presidency. They have spread all over the districts. They are found in Mysore and also in Bombay Presidency. The Komatis have septs which are of strictly exogamous character. The septs are of the totemic type, and the totem objects are revered in the usual way. Lotus, tulsi, grape, plantain, cow, elephant, buffalo, horse, cobra, bee, sun, moon—such are the various septs of the Komatis. Now-a-days the Komatis are claiming that they are the Vaiśyas mentioned in the Purusha-Sūkta; and accordingly, they are arranging their totems under different Brahmanical gotras. This Brahmanization of the caste would naturally require a considerable time for its maturity. In the Northern parts of the Madras Presidency, the sept is further subdivided into sections called Intiperulus. The Intiperulus are exogamous. Komatis claim maternal uncle's daughter in marriage, in accordance with the custom of Menarikam.[46]

---

44 Russell, III, p. 392. 45 Risley, I. p. 466.
46 Thurston, III. pp. 312-315.

(47) Konda Dora is a caste of hill-cultivators found chiefly in Vizagapattam. They have totemic divisions such as cobra, tortoise, tiger, sun etc. Among the Chinna Kondalu, the custom of Menarikam prevails; besides, a man can marry his sister's daughter.[47]

(48) Konga Vellāla is the cultivating caste of Trichonopoly district. They have a large number of exogamous septs the names of which generally denote some articles the use of which is taboo. The maternal uncle's daughter is the most desired bride; so much so that often times a young boy is married to his maternal uncle's daughter quite grown up in age, and the boy's father takes upon himself the duties of the husband, his own wife being permitted to consort herself with any one of her caste, provided she does not leave her husband's house.[48]

(49) Korā is a Dravidian caste of earth-workers of Chota Nagpur and Bengal. Where the exogamous groups are preserved, they are totemic. A man may not marry a woman belonging to his own totem. The rule is supplemented by the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy that prohibits marriage up to three generations in the descending line.[49]

(50) Korku is a Muṇḍa tribe of C.P. akin to the Korwas. They are divided into exogamous septs which are named after plants and animals. The septs were originally totemic; but the Korkus have generally forgotten their totemic usages. Marriage in the gota is barred, and so the marriage between the first cousins.[50]

(51) Kumhār is the potter caste found in U.P., Behar, Bengal, Orissa and Bombay. In Bengal they have

47 Thurston, III. p. 351. 48 Thurston, III. p. 418.
49 Risley, I. p. 507. 50 Russell, III. p. 556.

totemic septs, such as tortoise, sparrow, frog, etc. and they are exogamous. In the Eastern Bengal where Mahomedan influence is supreme, there are only two sections, and marriage is allowed between members of the same section. In Behar the exogamous septs are titular.[51]

(52) Kurmi is a very large cultivating caste of Upper India, Behar, Chota Nagpur and Orissa. The Kurmis have clearly totemic sections in Orissa and Chota Nagpur. In Behar the sections are titular, and the tendency is to discard the primitive rule of exogamy in favour of the more modern system of reckoning prohibited degrees. Wherever the section rule is in force, it is usually held that a man may not marry a woman of his own section or of the sections to which his mother and paternal and maternal grandmothers belonged.[52]In C.P. Kurmis are divided into all sorts of exogamous septs—titular, totemic, eponymous and territorial; marriage is prohibited in the same sept and between first and second cousins on the mother's side.[53]

(53) Kuruba is a caste of petty land-owners, shepherds, weavers and cultivators. They are spread over Bellary, Kistna and Madura districts. Their exogamous septs are of the totemic type, and they have retained the totemic character of their septs. Agni (fire), Āne (elephant), Ariya (noble), Chandra (moon), Bola (bangle), Bandi (cart), Malli (jasmine), Thuppa (clarified butter) are some of the names of the septs.[54]

(54) Madiga is the great leather-working caste of the Telgu country. They have six endogamous sub-castes, and each sub-caste is divided into exogamous septs which are of the totemic type. Silver, frog, donkey, locust, cow, scorpion, jasmine are some of their septs.[55]

51 Risley, I. p. 520. 52 Risley, I. p. 530.
53 Russell, IV. p. 60. 54 Thurston, IV. p. 142.
55 Thurston, IV. p. 319.

(55) Majhwār is an aboriginal tribe of Dravidian origin in Mirzapore. They are divided into totemic septs that are exogamous. No one can marry in his own sept or kuri. The rule is not supplemented by any rule of prohibited degrees, and so marriage between near kin may take place. The more advanced members of the tribe have adopted the rule of Brahmanical sapiṇḍa exogamy, prohibiting marriage in the line of the paternal uncle, paternal aunt, maternal uncle and maternal aunt. But the more primitive Majhwār adheres to the old Gond rule by which first cousins, provided they are not the offsprings of two sisters, by preference intermarry.[56] In C.P. they have exogamous groups which are clearly totemic. Marriage in the same sept is prohibited, and for three generations between persons related through females.[57]

(56) Mahār is the impure caste of menials, labourers and village watchmen. They have numerous exogamous septs which are named after plants and animals. Although no totemic usages are observed by the Mahārs now-a-days, the fact that most of their septs are named after plants and animals shows the totemic origin of these septs. A man cannot take a wife from his own sept; but he may marry in the mother's or grandmother's family. A sister's son may marry a brother's daughter; but the brother's son cannot marry the sister's daughter.[58]

(57) Māl is a Dravidian caste of Western and Central Bengal. Māls are divided into totemic sections; and a man may not marry a woman who belongs to the same totem group as himself. Besides the rule of sept exogamy marriage is prohibited up to five generations on the father's side and three on the mother's side.[59]

56 Crooke, III. p. 417. 57 Russell, IV. p. 152.
58 Russell, IV. p. 133. 59 Risley, II. p. 49.

(58) Mālo is a Dravidian boating and fishing caste. Many of their septs are totemic; but the totems are not, as usual, the names of birds and animals. Their totems are the various rivers. They may not marry in the father's as well as the mother's septs. For the rest, marriage is regulated by counting degrees down to seven generations in the descending line.[60]

(59) Māng is an impure caste of the Marāthā country. They are divided into exogamous groups which are the names of plants and animals, or they are of the titular nature. A man may not marry a girl from his own sept. In the Bombay Presidency their surnames are their exogamous septs. Māngs can marry maternal uncle's daughter, but neither paternal aunt's daughter nor maternal aunt's daughter.[61]

(60) The Marāthās regulate their marriage by Devaks which are named after well-known plants and animals. Devaks resemble the Canarese Balis. The sameness of Devaks is often a bar to marriage. Sometimes surnames are named after Devaks. Some Canarese Balis and Marāthā Devaks are identical. The Devaks are worshipped on the occasion of marriage, and also on the occasion of entering a new house. Besides kuls and surnames, Marāthās claim to have gotras like Brahmins; but the majority of the Marāthās do not know to what gotra they belong.[62]

(61). The Maravan is a Dravidian tribe of Madura and Tinnevelly. They are divided into six sub-tribes or trees. Each tree or Kothu is divided into three Khilais or branches. These Khilais may be called septs. Intermarriage is barred between Khilais belonging to the

60 Risley, II. p. 65. 61 Enthoven, II. p. 437.
62 Enthoven, III. p. 27.

same tree. Children belong to the Khilai of the mother and not of the father. Some of the Kothus are regarded as related to each other. For instance, a branch of betel vine may marry with a branch of cocoanut; but not with areca nuts or dates. A common rule among the Southern castes is that the most proper husband for a girl is her mother's brother or his son. But as the Maravans have matrilineal descent, a girl can never marry her maternal uncle, because the maternal uncle and his sister belong to the same Khilai. Children of brother and sister can marry, because they belong to different septs. The son often marries in his father's Khilai. The children of two brothers, however, cannot intermarry, though they belong to different septs.[63]

(62) Mīla is a fishing caste of Ganjam. They have totemic exogamous septs. They follow the custom of Menarikam. A Mīla can also marry his sister's daughter.[64]

(63) Muṇḍa is a large Dravidian tribe of Chota Nagpur. The Muṇḍas are divided into thirteen sub-tribes, and each sub-tribe is divided into numerous Kilis or septs which are totemic and exogamous. Some of the totems are Āmbā (mango), Chauria (rats), Budh (Wednesday), Chata (umbrella), Begear (tiger), Gidh (vulture), Kāna (crow), Nimak (salt.). A Muṇḍa may not marry a woman of his own sept; besides, the rule is supplemented by the usual rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy.[65]

(64) Nhāvi is the barbar caste of Bombay. They regulate their marriage by Devaks. In Khandesh the Nhāvis have totemic septs.[66]

(65) Nuniā is a Dravidian caste of Behar. Most of their sections are totemic. A man may not marry in

63 Thurston, V. pp. 33-34. 64 Thurston, V. p. 63.
65 Risley, II. p. 102. 66 Enthoven, III. pp. 131–133.

his own section. The rule is reinforced by the usua formula of sapiṇḍa exogamy.[67]

(66) Odde is a Telgu labouring caste. They have exogamous septs of the totemic type. Rock, buffalo, elephant, cot, jasmine are some of their septs.[68]

(67) Odiya is the principal farmer caste of Uriya. Their exogamous groups are totemic. The totems are worshipped on the occasion of marriage.[69]

(68) Omanaito is an Oriya cultivating caste. Their exogamous divisions are totemic. A man claims the daughter of his paternal aunt by right.[70]

(69) Orāon is a Dravidian cultivating tribe of Chota Nagpur. Their exogamous septs are extremely numerous, and most of them are totemic. A man may not marry a woman of his own sept; but there is no bar against mother's sept. They do observe some sort of sapiṇḍa exogamy, but none among them can accurately define the prohibited generations. An Orāon cannot marry his maternal aunt, or his first cousin on the mother's side. Some totems of the Orāons are tiger, rat, tortoise, vulture, iron, fox, etc.[71]

(70) Pān is a low weaving caste of Orissa and Chota Nagpur. The Pāns have totemic septs which are exogamous. Marriage within the sept is prohibited. They do not observe any rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy beyond barring marriage in the second generation from the paternal uncle.[72]

(71) Poroja is a nill-cultivating caste in Ganjam and Vizagapattam districts. They have totemic exo-

67 Risley, II. p. 135. 68 Thurston, V. p. 428.
69 Thurston, V. p. 437. 70 Thurston, V. p. 444.
71 Russell, IV. p. 302. 72 Risley, II. p. 156.

gamous septs, and they have yet retained the totemic character of their septs. Vulture, tiger, cobra are few of their septs. A man can marry his paternal aunt's daughter.[73]

(72) Rautia is a cultivating caste of Chota Nagpur The tribe is divided into totemic septs which are exogamous. Marriage is forbidden in the sept. The children of a brother and a sister or of two sisters can intermarry.[74]

(73) Savar is a primitive tribe of C.P. It is divided into totemic septs called the Bargas. Marriage within the Barga is barred, and sometimes marriage between first cousins is barred. In very few cases, the Barga is further sub-divided into two parts, and in that case each part is the exogamous unit.[75]

(74) Sudh is a cultivating caste of Uriya district. They are divided into totemic septs; and besides, there are many Bargas i.e. family names. Marriage within the gota and within the Barga is prohibited.[76]

(75) Tāmbats or copper-smiths regulate their marriage by Devaks. In the Deccan they regulate marriage by gotras.[77]

——:o:——

Castes that observe only the Rule of Sapiṇḍa Exogamy *i.e.* the Rule of Prohibited Degrees

(1) Aheria is a tribe of hunters in U.P. They have neither endogamous nor exogamous sub-divisions. Marriage of first cousins is prohibited; and a man can-

73 Thurston, VI. p. 210. 74 Russell, IV. p. 481.
75 Russell. IV. pp. 504-505. 76 Russell, IV. p. 515.
77 Enthoven, III. p. 363.

not be married in a family in which during memory a bride from his family has been given in marriage.[1]

(2) Arakh is a tribe of cultivators. At Hardoi the only rule of exogamy is that a boy is not married into a family to which a girl from his family has been already married.[2]

(3) Baheliya is a class of hunters in U.P. They prohibit marriage in one's own family, or in the family of the maternal uncle or father's sister, as long as relationship is remembered. In Oudh they will not give a bride to a family in which within the memory of a man a son has been married.[3]

(4) Bahna is a caste of cotton-cleaners in Berar. Most of the Bahnas are without sections. They regulate their marriage by rules of relationship. They allow a sister's son to marry a brother's daughter, but not vice versa.[4]

(5) Bargāh is a caste of U.P. The rule of exogamy is not to marry in a family with which they have been once connected in marriage, as long as any recollection of relationship exists..[5]

(6) Barhi is a carpenter class of the Punjab and U.P. They will not intermarry with a member of their own family or one of their maternal uncle's family or father's sister's family, as long as there is any recollection of relationship.[6]

(7) Bārui is a betel-cultivating class of Bengal. Bāruis profess Brahmanical gotras; but their exogamy is not based on them. Persons belonging to the same

1 Crooke, I. p. 41.
2 Crooke, I. p. 83.
3 Crooke, I. p. 106.
4 Russell, II. p. 71.
5 Crooke, I. p. 184.
6 Crooke, I. p. 192.

gotra can intermarry, provided they are not Samānodakas—related within fourteen generations.[7]

(8) Bauri is a cultivating and palanquin-bearing caste of Western Bengal. They have borrowed Brahmanical gotras; but marriage between persons belonging to the same Brahmanical gotra is not forbidden. They do not marry with persons descended from a male common ancestor up to seven generations and from a common female ancestor up to three generations. The people are, however, very ignorant, and on account of their incapacity to calculate generations, consanguineous marriages sometimes do take place.[8]

(9) Bhariya is a Dravidian tribe. It is divided into fifty-one septs. But sept is not necessarily the exogamous unit. As long as people can recollect relationship between themseleves, they cannot intermarry. But the memory of the Bhariya does not generally extend beyond the third generation.[9]

(10) Bhavsars in Gujarat avoid in marriage ten to twenty generations of agnates and only three generations of cognates.[10]

(11) Binjhwār is a Dravidian tribe of C.P. In Sambalpur where the caste is not divided into exogamous septs, marriage is regulated simply by relationship. Marriage between agnates is prohibited as long as the connection can be traced, but on the mother's side, the prohibition does not go beyond barring the union of the first cousins.[11]

7 Risley, I. p. 71. 8 Risley, I. p. 79.
9 Russell, II. p. 245. 10 Enthoven, I. p. 148.
11 Russell, II. p. 352.

(12) Chamār is the caste of the tanners. Many sub-castes of Chamārs in U.P. avoid only seven generations of descendants in marriage. In Bengal in certain places, they have exogamous divisions either of the territorial or local type. But generally marriage is regulated by counting the prohibited degrees up to seven generations in the descending line.[12]

(13) Dhānuk is a cultivating caste of Behar. They have comparatively few septs, and the influence of the septs on marriage is slowly dying out. Dhānuks are adopting the modern system of counting prohibited degrees, the prohibition extending to seven generations in the descending line.[13]

(14) Dheda is an untouchable caste chiefly found in Gujarāt. They forbid marriage between near relations. That is their only rule of exogamy.[14]

(15) Dhobis in U.P. have no exogamous gotras. They will not marry in their own kul (family) or in the maternal uncle's kul or in the father's sisters' kul, as long as any connection by marriage is remembered.[15] In Bengal they are called Dhobās. They have borrowed Brahmanical gotras; but in marriage the borrowed gotras do not play any part.[16] Dhobis have no exogamous divisions in Bombay. Marriage is prohibited when relationship can be traced between contracting persons. Marriage between the first cousins is disallowed.[17]

(16) Dom is a Dravidian menial caste. It is spread all over North India. In Banda they have exogamous sections, in as much as they will not give a bride to a

12 Risley, I. 177. 13 Risley, I. p. 221.
14 Enthoven, I. p. 325. 15 Crooke, II. p. 290.
16 Risley, I. p. 230. 17 Enthoven, I. p. 329.

section from which within memory they have taken a bride. In Gorakhpur they are developing gotras after the Hindu fashion. In both the places they do not marry their first cousins by blood. The Himalayan Doms observe a very simple rule of exogamy. The recognized descendants of one common ancestor will not intermarry. Some of them who are more Hinduised have adopted the entire rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy, and they avoid five and seven generations on the mother's and father's sides.[18]

(17) Dubla is the aboriginal race of Gujarat and Thana district. It has no exogamous septs. Marriage is barred when relationship is traced between the contracting parties. Marriage between first cousins is prohibited.[19]

(18) Dhuri is a caste belonging to Chhatisgarh (C.P.). They are divided into territorial septs; but they do not always prohibit marriage in the same sept. A man may marry after three generations, counted from the father's and mother's sides.[20]

(19) Dusādh is a menial tribe of mixed origin in U.P. They do not marry in the family of the maternal uncle and the family of their father's sister, till three generations have expired since the last connection. In their own family they do not marry as long as any recollection of relationship exists.[21]

(20) Gandhila is a vagrant tribe, very low in social order. They pretend that they have their exogamous gotras; but as a matter of fact they have none. The only rule of exogamy that they observe is that they do not marry a near relation.[22]

18 Crooke, II. pp. 322, 335. 19 Enthoven, I. p. 342.
20 Russell, II. p. 528. 21 Crooke, II. p. 350.
22 Crooke, II. p. 386.

(21) Gareri is a shepherd caste of Behar. From their four sub-castes, only the Dhengars are divided into exogâmous sections. Others follow the usual formula prohibiting marriage in the line of the paternal uncle, maternal uncle, paternal aunt and maternal aunt, calculated to six generations.[23]

(22) Hajām is the barber caste of Behar. Several sub-castes of Hajāms have no regular gotras, and they regulate their marriage by the standard formula of prohibited degrees.[24]

(23) The Halwāis in the Lucknow district have forgotten their exogamous groups; and the only prevailing rule of exogamy is the prohibition of marriage within seven generations from father's and mother's sides.[25]

(24) Hari is a menial caste of Bengal proper. It has no exogamous sections. Marriage is regulated by counting the prohibited degrees.[26]

(25) Kāchhi is a tribe of opium-growers and market-gardeners in U.P. They have five hundred and sixty endogamous sub-castes. But within the sub-caste exogamy is not properly formulated. In Farrukhabad a man cannot marry in the family of his paternal aunt and uncle. Those who are more advanced show a tendency to adopt the Brahmanical rules of exogamy.[27]

(26) Kahār is a tribe engaged in cultivation and menial work. It has 823 endogamous sub-castes. A man cannot marry in a family as long as relationship is remembered. If after subsequent enquiry, in spite of all precautions on his part, such relationship be ascertained, it does not matter.[28]

23 Risley, I. p. 271.
24 Risley, I. pp. 306, 307.
25 Crooke, II. p. 486.
26 Risley, I. pp. 371, 372.
27 Crooke, III p. 79.
28 Crooke, III. p. 97.

(27) Kapāli is a weaving caste of Bengal. They have only two sections, Śiva and Kaśyapa; but they are not exogamous. Marriage is regulated by counting prohibited degrees to three, or according to some, to seven generations in the descending line.[29]

(28) Kathak is a caste of story-tellers in U.P. The Kathaks have forgotten their exogamous gotras. The only thing that they can say is that their gotras correspond with those of the Kanaujiya and Saraswariya Brahmins. The rule of exogamy is that they cannot marry in the gotra, until at least seven generations have passed.[30]

(29) Kewat is a caste of fishermen in U.P. Their rule of exogamy prohibits marriage in the lines of aunt and uncle on the paternal and maternal sides, as long as any recollection of relationship can be followed.[31]

(30) Khangār is a tribe of village watchmen in U.P. and C.P. It has totemic exogamous septs. A man may not marry in the gotra of his father or mother, until three generations have passed.[32] In C.P. marriage within the sept is barred, and also the marriage between the first cousins.[33]

(31) Khatik is a cultivating and labouring class of U.P. and Behar. In Behar they regulate marriage by the standard formula calculated to five generations in the descending line. In Mirzapur they do not marry into the family of the maternal uncle, father's sister and mother's sister for three generations; and in their own family they do not intermarry for four generations.[34]

29 Risley, I. p. 421. 30 Crooke, III. pp. 173, 174.
31 Crooke, III. p. 217. 32 Crooke, III. p. 230.
33 Russell, III. p. 441. 34 Crooke, III. pp. 258, 259.

(32) Kisān is a caste of cultivators chiefly found in the Central Ganges-Jamna-Duab. A Kisān cannot give his daughter in marriage in a family where his son has been already married. Persons, descended from a common ancestor, do not intermarry for three or four generations. A man must not marry the children or grandchildren of his sister or daughter.[35]

(33) Korwa is a Dravidian caste. In Mirzapur they have no exogamous sub-divisions. The families of the mother's brother and the father's sister's husband are barred; and when a family lives together, members in the family cannot intermarry within four or five degrees.[36] In Madras and C.P. the Korwas have totemic septs which are exogamous.[37]

(34) Kochh is a large Dravidian tribe of North-eastern and Eastern Bengal. Their principal endogamous sub-division is Rājbansi. Rājbansis have borrowed only one Brahmanical gotra for their entire sub-caste. Marriage is regulated by the standard formula calculated to seven generations in the descending line from the paternal and maternal uncles and to three generations from aunts.[38]

(35) Lepcha is a Mongolian tribe of Sikkim, Western Bhutan and Eastern Nepal. The Lepchas are divided into twelve groups or Thars. At one time these Thars were exogamous. But now only one Thar has maintained its exogamous character. Others are now non-exogamous. The Lepchas follow the rule of prohibited degrees, by which marriage is barred up to three generations in the descending line.[39]

35 Crooke, III. p. 285. 36 Crooke, III. p. 324.
37 Russell, III. p. 574. 38 Risley, I p. 494.
39 Risley, II. p. 8.

(36) Lodha is an agricultural and labouring caste widely distributed in U.P. The Lodhas prohibit the intermarriage of near relatives both in the paternal and maternal lines, and will not give a bride to a family into which one of their youths has intermarried within the period of ordinary memory.[40]

(37) Lohār is the blacksmith caste. In U.P. they claim Brahmanical gotras such as Bharadvāja, Vasishtha Gautama and so on; but majority of the Lohārs do not know to which gotra they belong, and the rule of exogamy, usually followed, is the prohibition of marriage between blood relations on the father's and mother's sides.[41]

(38) Mallāh is a general term including various boating and fishing tribes. They are found in U.P. and Bengal. In Allahabad the descendants of a common ancestor are not allowed to intermarry; but with such people who have no professional genealogists, the recollection of relationship can seldom last for more than three or four generations; and after this, cousins find no objection in intermarrying.[42]

(39) Muchi is the cobbler caste of Bengal. They claim two Brahmanical gotras, Kaśyapa and Śāṇḍilya. But the two gotras are not taken into account in applying the rule of exogamy. Muchis do not marry within the usual prohibited degrees.[43]

(40) Musahar is a Dravidian jungle tribe in U. P. The rule of exogamy as observed by the Musahars is differently stated by different writers; but it may be stated as a general rule that they can intermarry with agnates or cognates after five or six generations or when

40 Crooke, III. p. 365. 41 Crooke, III. p. 376.
42 Crooke, III. p. 463. 43 Risley, II. p. 96.

all rememberance of relationship has been lost.[44] In Behar north of the Ganges, Musahars follow an elaborate system of sept exogamy and exclude four sections in marriage.[45]

(41) Nāi is the barber class of Northern India. In Bengal they are called Nāpits. In spite of their professed Brahmanical gotras marriage is generally regulated by counting prohibited degrees. The usual rule of exogamy in U.P. is to prohibit marriage in one's own family, and the families of the maternal uncle and father's sister, as long as relationship is remembered.[46]

(42) Panka is a low weaving tribe in U.P. Under their rule of exogamy marriage with the daughters of the maternal uncle and of the father's sister is strictly prohibited. Besides, they cannot marry in their own family as long as members are united and live together, no matter how distant relations may reside under the same roof.[47]

(43) Parahiya is a Dravidian tribe. In Mirzapur the only prohibited degrees are that a man cannot marry his daughter to the son of his brother, or cannot marry himself into the family of his children.[48]

(44) Pāsi is a Dravidian tribe principally found in the Eastern districts of U.P. The rule of exogamy is not very rigidly followed. Many Pāsis say that they bar all near relations generally. In Mirzapur they prohibit marriage in the families of maternal uncle, paternal uncle and maternal and paternal aunts, for seven generations in the descending line.[49] In C.P. they do not marry with relations as long as relationship is remembered.[50]

44 Crooke, IV. p. 19. 45 Risley, II. p. 115.
46 Crooke, IV. p. 42. 47 Crooke, IV. p. 114.
48 Crooke, IV. p. 127 49 Crooke. IV. p. 143.
50 Russell, IV. p. 383.

(45) Sundi is the liquor-distilling caste of Uriya country. They are divided into Bargas or family titles; but these Bargas are no longer exogamous units. Marriage is regulated by the rule of prohibited degrees. Persons, related to each other as sapiṇḍas, are barred from intermarrying.[51]

(46) Sathwara is a caste, chiefly found in Kathiawar, Cutch and Gujrat. Marriages are forbidden between the descendants of the collateral males up to seven degrees.[52]

(47) Sindhavas are found in Kaira district. They have no exogamous septs. Marriage is prohibited within four degrees of relationship.[53]

(48) Sūtradhar is the carpenter caste of Bengal. They have borrowed Brahmanical gotras; but from the point of exogamy the gotras are a sort of titular distinction; and to regulate their marriages they follow the modern system of counting prohibited degrees.[54]

(49) Taonla is a small non-Aryan caste of the Uriya States. They have no exogamous sections. Their common gotra is Nāga. Marriage is regulated by counting three generations from a common ancestor.[55]

(50) Teli is a caste of pressers of oil and traders in various commodities. In U.P. the rule of exogamy is that a man cannot marry in his own family and the family of the maternal uncle or father's sister, until at least three generations have passed. In Farukabad the Telis do not marry a near relation or the descendant of a common ancestor or blood relations on the father's and the mother's sides, as long as any relationship is remembered.[56]

51 Russell, IV. p. 535.
52 Enthoven, III. p. 323.
53 Enthoven, III. p. 336.
54 Risley, II. p. 288.
55 Russell. IV. p. 540.
56 Crooke, IV. p. 373.

In Bengal they regulate their marriages by sections which are of eponymous type. In Behar the sections are territorial. In Chota Nagpur and Orissa they have totemic exogamous groups.[57]

(51) Tiyar is a boating and fishing Dravidian caste of Bengal and Behar. They regulate marriage by the standard formula of sapiṇḍa exogamy, calculated to five generations in the descending line on the male side and three generations on the female.[58]

——:o:——

Local or Family Sections

These sections are generally small in size, and although exact dates of their formation cannot be determined, from their names one may see that they must have rather a recent origin.

(1) Agri is an agricultural caste of Thana and Kolaba districts. Their rule of exogamy bars marriage between persons having the same family name or surname. A man may not marry a cousin within five degrees of relationship. They have fifty-six Kuls or gotras; but the gotras are not regarded exogamous units.[1]

(2) Balija or Naidu is a large trading caste. In C.P. every family has a surname and also a gotra; but marriage is not regulated by gotra. The rule of exogamy prohibits marriage between persons of the same surname.[2]

(3) Some sub-castes of the Bhāts in U.P. are not divided into exogamous gotras. They will not marry any member of their Kul i.e. family, as well as may not marry their sister's daughter, father's sister's daughter,

57 Risley; II. p. 308. 58 Risley, II. p. 329.
1 Enthoven, I. p. 9. 2 Russell, II. p. 108.

mother's sister's daughter, brother-in-law's daughter and maternal uncle's daughter. But apparently the rule does not go further.[3]

(4) Some Chamār sub-castes do not marry in their own family, as well as the families of the mother, grandmother, and great grandmother. In Bombay Chamārs regulate marriage by surnames. A Chamār can marry the maternal uncle's daughter, but not the other cousins.[4]

(5) Darji is the tailor caste of Bombay. Their marriage is regulated by surnames. The rule is supplemented by the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy prohibiting marriage up to five generations.[5]

(6) Devangas or Hatkars are spread all over the Bombay Presidency except Gujrat. Their exogamous units are their surnames. In Nasik they have adopted Brahmanical gotras, and marriage is barred between persons belonging to the same surname and gotra. Marriage with father's sister's daughter and maternal uncle's daughter is generally allowed, but not with mother's sister's daughter.[6]

(7) Dhangars in the Bombay Presidency regulate marriage by surnames. A Dhangar can marry the maternal uncle's daughter, but not the other two first cousins.[7]

(8) Dumāl is an agricultural caste of Uriya country. They have a complicated system of exogamy. They have three kinds of sections, gota or sept, Barga (family), and Mitti (the earth from which they sprang i.e. the original village of the clan.) Marriage is only prohibited between persons who have the same gota, Barga and Mitti. If any one of those is different, marriage is allowed.[8]

---

3 Crooke, II. p. 24.
4 Enthoven, I. p. 264.
5 Enthoven, I. p. 296.
6 Enthoven, I. p. 306.
7 Enthoven, I. pp. 315-316.
8 Russell, II. p. 530.

(9) Gurav is a caste of village-priests of the temple of Mahādeva in the Marāthā country. They have no exogamous septs. Marriage is regulated by their surnames. A man cannot take a wife from a family of the same surname as his own, nor can he marry a girl related to him within six degrees from a male or female ancestor.[9]

(10) Halba is a caste of mixed origin chiefly engaged in agricultural work in C.P. The exogamous sections of the caste are of various types. Many of the section names recorded are such as belong to other castes. In Bastar the totem groups are called Bargas; and titular names are called Thoks. Persons belonging to the same surname or Thok or Barga cannot intermarry. Marriage of brother's daughter with sister's son is the most favourite match.[10]

(11) Krishnavakakkar is a pastoral caste of the Travancore state. They are divided into 72 families, and marriage between the members of the same house is absolutely forbidden.[11]

(12) Kunbi is a great cultivating caste of Bombay and C.P. The Kunbis are of a mixed origin; but they are largely recruited from non-Aryan tribes. Their exogamous septs called Kuls are nothing more than their surnames which are often expressive of a nickname or the place of the residence of the family—Kolhe (jackals), Kadu (bitter), Kāntode (one with a torn ear), Gadhe (ass), Nāktode (with broken nose)—are some of the specimens of their family names. Marriage within the same Kul is prohibited, and it is further prohibited in the family of the mother or either of the grandmothers. Marriage between first and second cousins is prohibited with the solitary exception of the maternal uncle's daughter

9 Russell, III. p. 178. 10 Russell, III. p. 189.
11 Thurston, IV. p. 77.

marriage with whom is regarded with great favour. Marāthā Kunbis have totemic Devaks and surnames. The sameness of the Devak or surname is severally a bar to marriage. Marriage with mother's sister's daughter is barred. The Kokan Kunbis have no Kuls. Surname regulates marriage.[12]

(13) Rāmoshis are chiefly found in Poona, Satara and Ahmednagar districts. The exogamous sub-divisions of the tribe are identical with surnames, but in some cases marriage can be contracted between persons bearing the same surname. Mother's sister's daughter cannot be taken for a wife.[13]

(14) Simpis or tailors regulate their marriages by surnames which form their exogamous septs. Marriage with mother's sister's daughter is prohibited.[14]

(15) Tāmbulis in Bengal and Orissa claim Brahmanical gotras. But they have a peculiar rule of exogamy. Persons, belonging to the same gotra but not of the same family name, are allowed to intermarry; and persons of the same family name may intermarry, if they do not belong to the same gotra. When the gotra and family name are the same, the rule is absolute. Marriage between sapiṇḍa relations also is prohibited.[15]

(16) Telis or oilmen in the Bombay Presidency regulate their marriages by surnames. A Teli can marry his maternal uncle's daughter, but not the other cousins.[16]

—: o :—

Titular or Nickname Groups

(1) Bhoyar is a cultivating tribe of C.P. The Bhoyars have over a hundred Kuls or sections which are exogamous. They are mostly of the titular type. Instances

12 Enthoven, II. pp. 288,311. 13 Enthoven, III. p. 299.
14 Enthoven, III. p. 329. 15 Risley, II. p. 292.
16 Enthoven, III. pp. 372–373.

of titular type are Hazāri (a leader of one thousand horses), Deshmukh (a leader of the country), Choudhari (a headman), Pinjāri (a cotton-cleaner), Chiknyā (a flatterer), Kasāi (a butcher), Gohattya (a cow-killer) and so on. Marriage within the Kul is forbidden, and also the union of first cousins.[1]

(2) Bhuiya is an important tribe of Chota Nagpur, Orissa, Bengal and C.P. In Sambalpur the Bhuiyas are divided into twelve exogamous septs, all of which are titular in origin, such as Thākur (the clan of royal blood), Padhān (a village headman), Chatria (one who carried the royal umbrella), Amāta (a counsellor).[2]

(3) Bhuiyār is a Dravidian tribe in U.P. In Mirzapur they have fifteen exogamous septs (Kuris). Many of these septs are nicknames, such as Karwa (bitter), Rāe (leader), Dāsput (the son of a slave), Bhaniha (he that has the rays of the sun) etc. Marriage within the Kuri is forbidden. The rule is not supplemented by the usual rule of prohibited degrees. As a result, marriage with the cognates in the third genertion is allowed.[3]

(4) Chakma is a tribe of uncertain origin in Bengal. Their exogamous septs (Gozas) are expressive of some peculiar adventure or personal characteristic of the supposed ancestor of the sept. Some septs are territorial.[4]

(5) Kādar is a non-Aryan tribe of cultivators and fishermen. In Behar they have titular sections which are exogamous. Marriage is prohibited in the section, and the rule is supplemented by the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy, prohibiting marriage up to seven generations of descendants on the father's side and three generations on the mother's side.[5]

1 Russell, II. pp. 301—302.
2 Russell, II. p. 316.
3 Crooke, II. p. 86.
4 Risley, I. p. 170.
5 Risley, I. p. 368.

(6) Kanjar is a name applied to an aggregate of vagrant tribes. Many of their gotras are occupational titles such as Kunchband (brush-maker), Kusbandh (collector of Kush-grass,) Pahalwān (athlet), Pattharkat (stone-cutter), Phānswār (strangler). Some are nicknames, such as Sapera (snake men), Jallād (executioner). The sections are exogamous. Marriage in the same section is barred, and in addition marriage of near cognates is barred.[6]

(7) Limbu is a tribe of Mongolian descent of Nepal. They have thirteen endogamous sub-tribes, and each of the sub-tribes is divided into a number of exogamous septs. Most of the septs refer to some personal adventure or the peculiarity of the founder of the original sept. Marriage within the sept is barred; but the rule of prohibited degrees is rather lax. Theoretically cousins cannot marry within three generations, or according to another report within seven generations. In actual practice marriage between very near cognates often takes place.[7]

(8) A sub-caste of the Māl—a Dravidian tribe of Bengal—is Māl Pahāriā. The exogamous septs of the sub-caste are of the titular type. For example, Pujhor (priest), Mānjhi (village headman), Grihi (house-holder) etc. They follow the rule of sept exogamy, reinforced by the usual rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy.[8]

(9) Mangar is one of the fighting tribes of Nepal. They are divided into exogamous septs some of which seem to be the nicknames of the founders of the septs. A man may not marry a woman of his own sept. Marriage is further barred up to three generations in the descending line.[9]

6 Crooke, III. pp. 137–139.
7 Risley, II. p. 16.
8 Risley, II. Appendix No. 1, p. 99.
9 Risley, II. p. 74.

(10) Patrā is an Oria caste. They have two endogamous sections; and the exogamous sections called Bamsams are of the titular type, such as Sāhu, Pātro, Nayako, etc.[10]

——:o:——

Territorial Divisions

These divisions refer to the ancient settlements of the septs or the birth-places of the founders of the septs.

(1) Agrahari is a sub-caste of the Baniyas. They are numerous in U.P. They have a number of exogamous groups; but they are known only to the few learned among them. Some of their gotras are Ajudhyābāsi (residents of Ayodhyā), Purabiya (those of the East), Pachhiwāha (of the West), Māhuli (from the Paragana of Māhul) and so on.[1]

(2) Ahīr is a caste of herdsmen and agriculturists found in the Punjab and U.P. Nandabansi, Jadubansi and Gaulbansi are the principal endogamous divisions. In the Western parts gotra system is in full force, and marriage is barred in the four gotras—gotra of the father, mother, grandfather and grandmother. In Behar the exogamous divisions are of the territorial type, and are called Mūls. Where the Mūls were found inconveniently large, they are further divided into Purukhs (sub-sections); and exogamy is based upon the Purukhs.[2]

(3) Bābhan is a large land-owning caste of Behar. The Bābhans have two sorts of exogamous divisions; the one is territorial, and the other is eponymous, the eponym being in most cases an ancient Ṛishi. Where the exogamous prohibitions based on these two classes

10 Thurston, VI. p. 176. 1 Crooke, I. p. 34.
2 Crooke, I. p. 57.

of sections conflict, as often happens, the authority of territorial class overrides that of the eponymous or the Brahmanical class. The Bābhans exclude the sections of the father and the mother in marriage. The rule of exogamy is supplemented by the usual Brahmanical formula of sapiṇḍa exogamy.[3]

(4) Bāri in U.P. is a class of domestic servants. They have five hundred and three exogamous sections. Some of the sections are Kanaujiya from Kanauj, Mathuria from Mathura, Bilkharia from Bilkhar etc. Exogamy is based on these gotras, and the rule is reinforced by a further rule that they cannot intermarry with a family with whom they have already contracted marriage connection. In Mutra they also avoid the mother's and grandmother's gotras.[4]

(5) Bhangi is the sweeper class of North India. They have 1359 endogamous sub-castes, and each endogamous group is sub-divided into exogamous septs. Names of certain Rajput septs are found among the Bhangis; but most of their septs are taken from the place of their origin. The Lāl Begi section of the Bhangis prohibits marriage in the sept to which a man belongs. He cannot also marry in the house of the maternal grandfather. In other sub-castes it may generally be said that all relations whose fathers and mothers can be traced back to any common ancestor may not marry. The Helas, a particular section of the Bhangis, do not marry in the family of the paternal grandfather, but the maternal grandfather's family is not excluded; and as a rule, they marry very near relations on the mother's side. In the Punjab the sweeper caste is known as the Chuhra. A Chuhra does not marry in his own section, but he has not developed any sort of sapiṇḍa exogamy.[5]

3 Risley, I. pp. 29-30. 4 Crooke, I. p. 202.
5 Crooke, I. pp. 278–279.

(6) Bhuīnhārs in U.P., according to the tradition, have a Brahmanical origin; but a study of their tribal organization will show that their claim to Brahmanical origin is merely fanciful. They have 84 Brahmanical gotras such as Kaśyapa, Vasishṭha, Parāśara, Bhārgava and so on. But in carrying out the rule of exogamy the Mūl or the territorial section is taken into consideration and not the Brahmanical gotra. With this exception they follow the standard formula of prohibited degrees[6].

(7) Burud is the caste of bamboo-workers. In C. P. they are divided into exogamous septs which are either territorial or totemic. Marriage of persons belonging to the same Baink or sept and also that of first cousins is forbidden.[7]

(8) Cheruman is a Malayālam caste of agricultural serfs. With the Cherumans marriage is prohibited among the members of the same family group (Kootam). In Chittur Taluk members of the same village do not intermarry on account of their belief that their ancestors may have served as serfs the same landlord, and thus they are the descendants of the same father. A man can marry his father's relations but not the mother's relations. In Palghat the Cherumans assert that they do not marry relatives within seven generations.[8]

(9) Dāngi is an agricultural tribe near Jhansi. Their exogamous gotras are of the territorial type. The rule of exogamy is very brief. Marriage in the same gotra and marriage between the first cousins are prohibited.[9]

(10) Dhānuk is a low caste of agriculturists in Narasingpore, C.P. They have exogamous sections which

6 Crooke, II. p. 68. 7 Russell, II. pp. 209–210.
8 Thurston, II. p. 67. 9 Crooke, II. p. 247.

are clearly of the territorial type. Marriage within the gota is forbidden, but not between the first cousins.[10]

(11) Dhobis in C.P. have exogamous groups known as Kheroes, taking their names generally from villages Marriage within the Khero is barred, and so between the first cousins.[11]

(12) Dosādh is a degraded Aryan caste or a Brahmanized Dravidian caste of Behar and Chota Nagpur. Most of their sub-castes are divided into territorial or local exogamous sections. The Bāhaliyā sub-caste has no sections. The only rule of exogamy is the prohibition of marriage within seven generations in the descending line. In the other sub-castes they affect to exclude the sections of their (1) father, (2) paternal grandmother, (3) paternal great grandmother, (4) paternal great great grandmother, (5) mother, (6) maternal grandmother and (7) maternal great grandmother. Besides this there is the usual rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy to supplement the rule of sept exogamy. It is very doubtful, if such a complicated and far-reaching rule is verbally followed.[12]

(13) Goalā is a name by which Ahīrs are known in Bengal, Behar and Chota Nagpur. In Bengal they have six Brahmanical gotras, and they may not marry in the Brahmanical gotra. Connection with a girl from the mother's gotra is not, however, barred. In Behar the Brahmanical gotras are unknown; and marriage is regulated by a large number of Muls or exogamous groups of territorial type. The Satamulia Goalās in Bhagalpur avoid seven gotras, and sometimes even nine gotras in marriage. In excluding these seven or nine Muls, sometimes not only the bride's Mul is considered, but the Muls

10 Russell, II. p. 486. 11 Russell, II. p. 520.

12 Risley, I. p. 253.

of her female ancestors are also taken into account. The rule of sept exogamy is reinforced by the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy, prohibiting marriage up to the fourth generation.[13]

(14) Gūjar is an important agricultural and pastoral caste in the Punjab and the Western districts of U.P. In Ludhiyana they possess eighty-four gotras as may be seen from the fact that they are called 'lights of eighty-four gotras'. The census lists, however, give 1178 gotras. Most of these gotras are of the territorial origin, while some are derived from the titles of the tribal leaders. The rule of exogamy varies with different sub-castes. Some sub-castes avoid four gotras; others avoid three, permitting marriage in the mother's father's gotra.[14]

(15) Halwāi is the confectioner class of Behar. They have numerous territorial sections which are exogamous. A man may not marry a woman of his own section, or of the sections to which his mother and his paternal grandmother may belong. The sections, however, are taken into account on both sides. Thus, if the proposed bride's mother belonged to the same section as the bridegroom's paternal grandmother's, no marriage can take place although the bride and the bridegroom may belong to different sections. The rule is supplemented by the usual rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy.[15]

(16) Irula is a jungle tribe of the Nilgiris. It has sub-divisions of the territorial type which are exogamous.[16]

(17) Jāts are in every respect the most important Punjab caste. The question of their origin is yet a matter for speculation. The Jats are divided into two main

13 Risley, I. pp. 285–286. 14 Crooke, II. pp. 443–444.
15 Risley, I. p. 310. 16 Thurston, II. pp. 380–381.

divisions—the Shib-gotra and Kāshib-gotra. For the purpose of marriage the caste is divided into numerous exogamous sections. Majority of the section-names cannot be explained; but in all probability, they are the corrupted forms of the names of villages. Some septs together form one exogamous group, as they are believed to be related to each other and cannot intermarry. A man must not marry within his own section or in the sections of his mother, grandmother and the husband of his father's sister.[17]

(18) Kallan is a turbulent and thieving class of Madura and Tanjore districts. Most of their septs seem to be of the territorial type. The Mel Nādu Kallans have three septs—east street, north street and south street. In Tanjore the Kallans have such septs, as 'king of Pallavas,' 'king of Tanjore,' 'conqueror of the south, etc. Some of the septs of the Kallans are merely fanciful, such as 'cruel-handed tiger,' 'cruel-legged tiger,' 'holy tiger' etc. The Nāttar Kallans of Shivganga have exogamous septs called Kīlais i.e. branches which run in the female line. Among many castes in the Madras Presidency a man can marry his sister's daughter; but this is not possible among the Nāttar Kallans; because the maternal uncle, the girl and her mother, all belong to the same sept. But children of brother and sister may intermarry; because they belong to different septs.[18]

(19) Kalwār is a liquor-selling and trading caste of Behar. It has exogamous sections of the territorial type; but Kalwārs further west seem to have dropped their sections altogether, and the prohibition against intermarriage extends to members of their own family, and

17 Rose, II. p. 375; Russell, III. p. 233.

18 Thurston, III. pp. 72-73.

to cousins for three generations or as long as any relationship is recollected.[19]

(20) Kānikar is a jungle tribe inhabiting the mountains of South Travancore. The Kānikars are divided into five exogamous sections, and the sections are named after mountains and places such as Pālamala, Talmala, Vellanāt, etc.[20]

(21) Kāpusavara is a hill tribe of Ganjam. They do not marry in their own village; but thy are now-a-days following the practice of Menarikam,and thus marrying in the village in spite of the rule of exogamy.[21]

(22) Kāyastha is the well-known writer-class of Hindustan. They are spread over Bengal, Behar and U.P. In U. P. they are divided into twelve endogamous sub-castes. Some of these sub-castes maintain the organization of local groups or Als; and marriage cannot take place between persons belonging to the same Al; nor can a man marry a woman belonging to the Al of his maternal grandfather or great grandfather. In those sub-castes, where local sections do not exist, the rule of Brahmanical sapiṇḍa exogamy, prohibiting marriage up to fifth generation on the mother's side and seventh on the father's side is observed. The Behar Kāyasthas claim Brahmanical gotras; but their exogamy is not based upon these gotras. It is based upon Kuls—exogamous sections mostly of the territorial type. Only the father's Kul is excluded in marriage. The system is supplemented by the usual rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy current among the Brahmins.[22]

---

19 Crooke, III. p. 109. 20 Thurston, III. p. 169.
21 Thurston, VI. p. 323.
22 Crooke, III. p. 194 ; Risley, I. p. 446.

(23) Khatri is the principal commercial caste of the Punjab. Many Khatris have settled down in Behar and Bengal. The Khatris in the Punjab are divided into three main groups. (1) Bāri, having twelve septs, (2) Bunjāhi, having fifty-two septs, (3) Sarīn. The Khatris have two kinds of sections, their own sections and sections borrowed from the Brahmin community. For the purpose of marriage, only their original sections, most of which are territorial, are taken into account; and the Brahmanical gotra is ignored. The three sections, Kapur, Khannā and Meharā, all belong to the Kausalya gotra; but members of these group freely intermarry, The Khatris follow the usual rule of Brahmanical sapiṇḍa exogamy.[23]

(24) Khond is a Dravidian tribe of Orissa. They have fifty Gochis or exogamous septs. Each of these Gochis bears the name of a Muta or village. All members of a Gochi believe that they are descended from a common ancestor. Each Gochi is further split up into sub-septs; but exogamy of the Khonds does not seem to have been based on these sub-septs. A Khond can marry his maternal uncle's daughter.[24]

(25) Kirār is a cultivating caste of mixed origin in C.P. Their exogamous septs are of the territorial type. Marriage in the gotra is prohibited, and in the same way marriage in the families of grandmother, paternal uncle and maternal aunt for three generations.[25]

(26) Kohli is a cultivating caste of C.P. They have exogamous septs either of the territorial type or of the titular type, such as Nāgpure (from Nagpur), Parvate (from mountains), Hundifode (one who breaks a

23 Rose, II. p. 512 ; Risley, I. p. 480.
24 Risley, I. pp. 400–401 : Russell, III. p. 466.
25 Russell, III. pp. 487–488.

cooking vessel). Marriage in the gota is prohibited. Sister's son marries brother's daughter, but not vice versa.[26]

(27) Kolis or fishermen in Gujrat consider their village as an exogamous unit, marriage within the village being barred. The Kolis in Konkan prohibit marriage in the family. Children of brother and sister cannot intermarry.[27]

(28) Kolta is an agricultural caste of Sambalpur district (C.P.). They have family names—gotras; and in addition they possess the Bargas or the exogamous groups. Gotras are named after animals, while the Bargas are territorial in their origin. Marriage within the Barga is prohibited, and so also marriage between first cousins on the father's side. To have the same gotra is not a bar for marriage.[28]

(29) Kori is a Hindu weaving caste of C.P. It is divided into territorial exogamous septs called Bainks. Some septs are totemic. Marriage in the sept and between first cousins is prohibited.[29]

(30) Kotas are the residents of the Nilgiri plateau. They form compact communities, and inhabit seven villages. Every village is divided into three streets (Keris). At Kotagiri, one of their settlements, the three streets are named Kil-keri, Nādu-keri and Mel-keri, i.e. lower, central and upper streets. People living in the same Keri cannot intermarry, as they are supposed to constitute one family. At Sholur, another Kota settlement, they are divided into four Keris—Near street, Lower street, Other street and That street. Near street and Lower

---

26 Russell, III. p. 495. 27 Enthoven, II. pp. 246, 258.
28 Russell, III. pp. 538-539. 29 Russell, III. p. 546.

street form one exogamous group, while the other two streets form the second exogamous group.[30]

(31) Māli is a functional caste of flower gardeners. In C.P. they are divided into exogamous septs which are generally territorial in origin. Marriage is barred between members of the same sept, and first and second cousins cannot intermarry.[31]

(32) Nunia is a mixed occupational caste in C.P. and U.P. They are not divided into clear exogamous divisions. In Mirzapur they have local sub-divisions called Dīh. Every Dīh is named after some village. The word Dīh itself means a village.[32]

(33) Santāl is a large Dravidian tribe of Western Bengal, Northern Orissa, Bhagalpur and the Santāl Paraganas. They have twelve exogamous septs, and the septs are further divided into sub-septs. The septs appear to have territorial origins. Marriage is prohibited within the sept or sub-sept. The Santāls do not take into account the mother's sept.[33]

(34) Sonār is the goldsmith caste of India. They have numerous territorial septs which are exogamous. In Behar they exclude seven septs in marriage. In applying these prohibitions to any particular case, the sections of both the parties are taken into consideration. They have pure Brahmanical gotras, but these gotras do not play any part in marriage.[34] In C. P. marriage within the sept is prohibited, and in some cases marriage between kins, related within five degrees, is prohibited

---

30 Thurston, VI. p. 251.

31 Russell, IV. p. 166. 32 Russell, IV. p. 295.

33 Risley, II. pp. 226–227. 34 Risley, II. p. 256.

at the same time.[35] In some localities marriage between brother's and sister's children is allowed. In Bombay, in some places they claim Brahmanical gotras and regulate their marriage accordingly. Where the Brahmanical gotras are not in existence, surnames serve as the exogamous units. Sonārs can marry their maternal uncle's daughter but not the other cousins.[36]

(35) Sutārs, also known as Vādves in some parts of the Ratnagiri district, have their exogamous groups named after villages. Persons residing in the same village cannot intermarry.[37]

(36) Thāru is a non-Aryan tribe of Behar and Upper India. It is divided into sections which are of the territorial or titular type. Marriage within the sept is barred, and the rule is supplemented by the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy, prohibiting marriage up to four generations in the descending line.[38]

(37) Toda is a peculiar tribe of the Nilgiri Hills. The Todas have very little in common with Dravidian tribes. Among the Todas totemism is conspicuous by its absence. Their exogamous clans are named after villages. There are two endogamous divisions of the Todas, and each division is further sub-divided into territorial exogamous septs. When a sept becomes too large, it is divided into two or more septs; when the division has taken place within recent times, the two septs are regarded as one for regulating marriage; but when sufficiently long time has passed after the separation, the original relationship between the two clans is conveniently ignored. The Todas prohibit marriage with

---

35 Russell, IV. p. 520. 36 Enthoven, III. p. 340.
37 Enthoven, III. p. 357. 38 Risley, II. p. 314.

the daughter of the mother's sister and the daughter of the father's brother. The natural wife for a man, according to the Toda ideals, is the daughter of the father's sister or mother's brother.[39]

—:o:—

Exogamous Divisions based upon the number of gods that each family worships

(1) Baiga is a primitive Dravidian tribe of the Satpura Hills. Their septs are totemic, but the Baigas have forgotten the meanings of their totems. A Baiga cannot marry a girl of his own sept or a girl worshipping the same number of gods. Mother's sept is not barred, and in some localities the unions of first cousins are permitted.[1]

(2) Bhuiyas have no exogamous divisions in Raigarh. When they wish to marry, they compare the family gods of the parties, and if these are not identical, and there is no recollection of common ancestor for three generations, the union is allowed.[2]

(3) At Chanda the Gonds are classified according to the number of gods worshipped by each person. There are four main groups worshipping seven, six, five and four gods respectively, and each group contains ten to fifteen septs. A man cannot marry a woman of any sept which worships the same number of gods as himself. Formerly there were classes worshipping one, two and three gods; but these three divisions have been now merged in larger groups. This classification, according to the number of gods each clan worshipped, is being slowly forgotten. In Chhindwada and other places, there are only two divisions who respectively worship seven and

39 Rivers, "The Todas," pp. 505, 512.

1 Russell, II. p. 81. 2 Russell, II. p. 316.

six gods. A person cannot marry in his own division every member of which is regarded as his Bhaibanda; but he can marry with any woman of the second division. The two divisions include many small septs, but the septs are inoperative in regulating marriage.[3]

(4) Kudubis have exogamous septs which denote the god which is kept in the house of the most respected member of each sept.[4]

(5) Kurumo is an Uria agricultural class. In some laces marriage restrictions are based on the house-gods. Persons who worship the same house-god may not intermarry.[5]

(6) Mannewār is a small tribe in C.P. It is divided into three exogamous septs, worshipping four, five and six gods respectively. A man must not marry a girl worshipping the same number of gods as himself. When the girl is a deformed one, or when nobody solicits her hand, she is given away with her sister to the first cousin or to some other near relative.[6]

(7) Nāttukotai Chetti is a money-lending caste of Madura. They are divided into nine exogamous divisions named after the respective temples (Kovils) in which they worsihp.[7]

——: o :——

In the above lists I have tried to include every Hindu caste which is numerically considerable, or which practises any peculiar rule of sept or sapiṇḍa exogamy. Apart from the variety of the origins of exogamous septs one may see from the lists that in Northern India and

3 Russell, III. p. 66. 4 Thurston, IV. p. 100.
5 Thurston, IV. 178. 6 Russell, IV. pp. 195-196.
7 *Thurston*, V. p. 261.

especially in Behar, high class Hindus other than the Brahmins have carried the principle of sept exogamy too far. Mother's sept in addition to the father's sept is almost uniformly avoided by high class non-Brahmins in Northern India. In Behar they forbid marriage in seven septs and sometimes even in nine septs. For example, the Goālās avoid in marriage (1) one's own sept, (2) mother's sept, (3) maternal grandmother's sept, (3) maternal great grandmother's sept, (5) Paternal grandmother's sept, (6) Paternal great grandmother's sept, (7) Paternal great great grandmother's sept, (8) Paternal grandmother's mother's sept, (9) and the sept of paternal great grandmother's mother.[1] The septs are taken into account on both sides. If the proposed bride's mother belonged to the same sept as the bridegroom's paternal grandmother's, there can be no marriage, although the bride and the bridegroom belong to different septs. In Eastern Bengal, however, one may find that many castes have given up their exogamous septs, and they now regulate marriage simply by counting the prohibited degrees. As pointed out by Risley, this may be due to the influence of the Mohammedans who form the bulk of the total population of Eastern Bengal, and who do not observe any sort of sept exogamy. With the solitary exception of the Mādhyandina Brahmins all castes in the Deccan avoid only the father's sept in marriage.

Another obvious thing that may be observed from the lists is that almost all castes of the Dravidian or mixed origin are gradually being Brahmanized. I have mentioned some purely Dravidian castes that have adopted the Brahmanical gotras, and who regulate their marriage according to Brahmanical usage. Some castes have made this transformation within recent memory. A hybrid

1. Risley, I, p. 285

Mongoloid tribe known as Suraj-Bansi assumed Brahmanical gotras so recently as the year 1871. Other castes like the Kāyasthas profess Brahmanical gotras, but they base their exogamy upon their territorial septs, and not upon their Brahmanical gotras. As regards the Bombay Presidency, the Marāthās, the Bhandāris, the Tāmbats and several other castes have recently begun to claim the Brahmanical gotras. But although some advanced people of these castes may be regulating their marriage by these newly assumed gotras, as a rule an average man belonging to these castes is completely ignorant of his Brahmanical gotra. It will be considerable time before all members of these castes adopt fully the Brahmanical rule of gotra exogamy.

As regards the purely Dravidian tribes, they are slowly forgetting their totemic usages, although in many cases they have retained the totemic names of their clans. Regarding the continuous Brahmanization of the mixed and Dravidian castes, it may be further observed that, while they are vieing with each other in adopting the Brahmanical customs, the Brahmin community as a whole is getting rid of its traditional rigidity of social life. The Brahmin is fast forgetting his pravaras, and although he sticks to gotra exogamy, the gotra bereft of its pravara backbone is a meaningless dogma. If the present tendencies continue to grow, one need not be surprised, if in course of time Brahmins begin to regulate their marriages by surnames, and finally, by observing only the rule of prohibited degrees.

As regards the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy, it may be observed that in the Deccan most of the Dravidian and mixed castes allow marriage with the cognates in the third generation. Cross-cousin marriage is not only

permitted, but it is often a favourite marriage; and in some cases, according to the custom of Menarikam, it is compulsory. The cousin-marriage, is, however, restricted to maternal uncle's daughter and paternal aunt's daughter. Children of two sisters and children of two brothers are strictly forbidden to intermarry. The universal prohibition of intermarriage between the children of two sisters is most probably the survical of the matrilineal descent which is believed to have had a wide prevalence in the past. In a tribe following a matrilineal descent, the children of two sisters will belong to the same sept, and they are naturally unmarriageable. Father's sister's daughter and maternal uncle's daughter will belong to a different clan, and so they are favoured for marriage. In some Dravidian tribes the relation between the maternal uncle and the nephew is a peculiar one. The uncle arranges the marriage of his nieces, and sometimes claims the nieces for his sons. If the nieces are not married to his sons, he is to be compensated for it. But the most popular form of cousin-marriage is between sister's son and brother's daughter, and less frequently between a man and his father's sister's daughter.

That cousin-marriage is particularly a Dravidian custom may be seen from the fact that in the principal Dravidian languages, wife's father receives the same name 'Māman' as mother's brother, and the mother-in-law and maternal uncle's wife are also known by an identical name. In Tamil and Telugu the father's sister's husband is also called Māman or Māmā, while the mother's brother's wife and the father's sister are both named in Telugu as Āttās. "Further, in all the three Dravidian languages the mother's brother's son, the father's sister's son and the brother-in-law receive the same name, Maittunan in Tamil, Bāva in Telugu, and Bhavameida, Bhava or,

Meidana in Canarese."[2] Thus, it will be seen that at one time the practice of cousin-marriage must have been extremely popular in the Dravidian tribes.

The prohibition of intermarriage between the children of two sisters may be explained by the matrilineal descent prevalent at some time or other. But the prohibition of intermarriage between the children of two brothers is not easily explicable in a tribe following a matrilineal descent. The Nāyars of Malbar who follow the matrilineal descent prohibit marriage between the childern of two sisters and also two brothers, although the children of two brothers belong to two different clans, the clans of their respective mothers. It may be that some primitive tribes followed the matrilineal descent, while at the same time other tribes were patrilineal. With the matrilineal descent children of two sisters cannot intermarry, as they belong to the same clan. According to the patrilineal descent the children of two brothers cannot intermarry. As the patrilineal tribes and the matrilineal ones lived side by side, and as there is no record of any natural or special antipathy existing between these tribes, each tribe may have borrowed the peculiar exogamous prohibitions of the other. Thus, people following a matrilineal or patrilineal descent, alike prohibited the intermarriage between the children of two sisters or of two brothers.

An explanation, perhaps more plausible than the above, of the wide-spread prohibition of marriage between parallel cousins has been given by Rivers. In a dual system of society there are only two social groups each group being an exogamous unit. Under such a

2 W. H. R. Rivers, in R. A. Society's Journal, (1907), pp. 620, 621.

system whether the descent be patrilineal or matrilineal, children of two brothers or of two sisters must belong to the same moiety, and thus cannot intermarry[3]. The explanation must be accepted as a completely satisfactory one, provided we are ready to grant the uniform existence of the dual system of society in the remote past.

In dealing with the rule of Brahmanical sapiṇḍa exogamy, I have already pointed out that, although the Northern Smṛiti-writers did their best to develop sapiṇḍa exogamy, and although they enjoined marriage beyond seven generations on the father's side and five generations on the mother's side, the rule was never recognised in the Deccan. Even in Northern India, although Hindu Legislators were successful in prohibiting marriage generally in the third generation, the entire rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy was not always faithfully followed. The rule of prohibited degrees—sapiṇḍa exogamy—was an Indo-Aryan invention. Sapiṇḍa exogamy is foreign to Dravidian culture. The Dravidian was an enthusiast only as far as the sept exogamy led him. If marriage between two sisters' children was barred, that was not due to any prohibitive rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy, but that prohibition was only a survival of the matrilineal descent which was widely prevalent among the Dravids in ancient times.

Regarding the marriage of the widows, in the Ṛigveda times, the practice of levirate was current among the Indo-Aryans[4]. But along with the rise of sept and sapiṇḍa exogamy among the Indo-Aryans, the levirate slowly fell into disuse, although it lingered in a changed form

3 W. H. R. Rivers, "Kinship and Social Organization", (1914), pp. 72-73.

4 Rig. X—18-7, 8; X—40-2.

under the name 'Niyoga', till some centuries after Christ. Brahmin community as a whole has now denounced widow marriage, although by a special legislation Government has legalized it. Other high-class Hindus generally follow the Brahmins in this matter. Low caste Hindus and many purely Dravidian races permit widow marriage. The widow in some castes has to marry the elder brother of the deceased, and in some castes, the younger brother of the deceased. In other castes the widow is prevented from marrying any of her brothers-in-law, but she has to marry some one from her caste.

CHAPTER XII

Exogamy of the Hindus in the Light of Eugenics

In the foregoing pages exogamy of the Hindus has been fully described. In the present chapter I propose to examine the rules of exogamy in the light of eugenics.

All high-class Hindus and purely Dravidian races observe the rule of sept exogamy, while most of the intermediate castes regulate their marriage by the formula of prohibited degrees or by their surnames or family names. The Brahmins are required to observe the most comprehensive form of exogamy. Intermarriage between persons belonging to the same gotra or pravara is strictly forbidden. Besides the rule of sept exogamy, the Hindus in Northern India observe the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy that prohibits marriage within certain generations of the cognates. The net result of all these prohibitions is that intermarriage of persons belonging to the same gotra or pravara is barred for all times. By the strict rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy 2121 girls in all are rendered unmarriageable.[1] In Northern India most of the high-class non-Brahmin castes prohibit marriage in the father's as well as the mother's gotra. In Behar, in some castes a

1 I should like to mention here that, although the Hindu Law prohibits marriage between sagotra persons, under the Special Marriage Amendment Act of 1923 it is possible for a Hindu to contract a valid marriage with a sagotra girl, provided she is not related to him within certain degrees of consanguinity. A Hindu, marrying under this Act, is, however, deemed to effect his severance from his undivided family. He also loses his right of adoption. Although the Special Marriage Amendment Act exists in the Statue books, it is very rarely resorted to by the Hindus in contracting their marriages.

person has to avoid as many as nine gotras. These prohibitions are rendered far more intensive in their appli cation in India on account of the very small endogamous sub-divisions of castes. Sometimes an endogamous sub-caste within which a man must select his bride does not count even a thousand members. Within such a microscopic endogamous sub-caste and under the operation of the rules of sept and sapiṇḍa exogamy, the difficulty of securing a suitable marriageable girl is simply to be imagined. Under the two-fold restrictions of endogamy and exogamy, a Hindu youth's field for selecting a bride has been unnaturally narrowed down.

It is a problem deserving a careful consideration, whether the exogamous restrictions, prevalent among the Hindus, have done, or are doing, any material good to the society. Marriage is a social question, and it must be considered with an unbiassed mind free from any religious prejudices. In India in the Vedic times, marriage was regarded more or less a social necessity. The wife was expected to be the mother of a hero; she was expected to give birth to ten sons; she was expected to grow and act a lady of her new house. On reading the marriage hymn[2] in the Ṛigveda, we do not find that any religious importance was attached to marriage. Aims of the Ṛigvedic marriage seem purely to be social and practical. Progeny—good and valiant progeny—was the principal aim of marriage. From the days of the Sūtra works, exogamous and endogamous restrictions began to be enforced, and as time went on, the restrictions grew more wide and more rigid. As we are not directly concerned here with the endogamous restrictions, I will confine myself only to the consideration of the exogamous restrictions.

2 Ṛig. X—85.

The supporters of sept and sapiṇḍa exogamy emphasize the evil effects of inbreeding and the advantages of crossing. As we have seen in a preceding chapter, some writers try to trace the origin of exogamy to the knowledge of the evil effects of inbreeding by the primitive mind. I have tried to show that this explanation of exogamy is untenable, in as much as the uncultured mind of the primitive man cannot be expected to possess a grasp of continuous results, and a capacity to formulate a universal rule to remedy the evil. But now the question must be answered, are the much-spoken-of ill effects of inbreeding real, or are they imaginary ?

At the outset it is necessary to define inbreeding. Inbreeding is a relative term. A Hindu from Behar who avoids nine septs in marriage will charge with inbreeding a Deccani Hindu who habitually marries the cognatic relations in the third generation. A Deccani Hindu may level the charge of inbreeding against the Christians and the Mohammedans who allow marriage between parallel cousins.

In answering the question, "Whether inbreeding produces bad effects," we shall have to view inbreeding in a broad sense as opposed to cross-breeding. Old biologists were of opinion that inbreeding tends invariably to sterility, mental degeneration and many other physical deformities. Churchmen and medical men harped on the same string. It was not till the latter half of the nineteenth century that biologists tried to see by actual experiments the results of inbreeding on different animals and plants. As a result of these experiments, it is observed that sterility or deformity or degeneracy are not inherent in inbreeding, and they are not interrelated as cause and effect. Inbreeding, as a method of propoga-

tion, achieves two things. It isolates what are known as unit characters, and intensifies them. Under the process of inbreeding, if bad characters are inter-mated, bad characters will be observed in the progeny in an intensified form. If desirable characters are inbred, the progeny will show those characters in a confirmed and improved form. Inbreeding by itself cannot produce good results or bad results. It depends upon the stocks inbred. By itself it cannot produce fecundity or barrenness. Deformity or beauty is not to be attributed to inbreeding by way of effect. The principal effect of inbreeding is the manifestation and the development of dormant characters. As observed by East and Jones, " If evil is brought to light, inbreeding is no more to be blamed than a detective who unearths a crime. Instead of being condemned, it should be commended. After continued inbreeding, a cross-bred stock has been purified and rid of abnormalities, monstrocities and serious weaknesses of all kinds. Only those characters can remain which either are favourable or are not definitely harmful in the organism[3]". Alfred Huth in the concluding chapter of his " Marriage of Near Kin " writes, "On the other hand we have seen many cases of in-and-inbreeding in isolated communities, and more especially among domestic animals, in which no evil effects have been observed[4]. "

It may be contended that the beneficial results of inbreeding, obtained in the case of plants and domestic animals, cannot uniformly be expected in the case of man. It must be admitted that there is a measure of truth in the contention. Experiments of inbreeding with the plants and domestic animals can be completely guided and controlled by us, but as soon as we reach the

3 "Inbreeding and outbreeding", p. 140.

4 "Marriage of Near Kin", p. 338.

sphere of humanity, our perception often fails and our control is loosened. Unit characters in a human creature are always complex, and they often times defy analysis. In plant life or in a domestic animal, if some undesirable recessive characteristic develops and comes to prominence as a result of inbreeding, it can do but limited harm With human society the question assumes a different aspect. There may be cases where the development of the undesirable recessive characteristics may be a serious menace to the rest of the society. All these are sound considerations no doubt, but they are applicable to those societies in which continuous in-and-inbreeding just as the brother and sister marriage is being practised. Marriage between brother and sister is at present totally absent in all civilized societies. When we talk of inbreeding, what is really meant is the mating of cognates or agnates in the third generation or onward. Even the severest critics of inbreeding shall have to grant that the danger of undesirable developments consequent upon inbreeding is considerably reduced in cousin-marriage.

Leaving aside the scientific discussion about the effects of inbreeding, I should like to consider the problem from a practical point of view. For a Hindu mind the Mohamedans and the Christians practise inbreeding, in as much as they approve of marriage between parallel cousins and cross cousins. These two communities are practising cousin-marriages for hundreds of years; and they have not shown the slightest sign of degeneration, mental or physical. The vigour of these communities is unquestionable. The Mohamedans once aspired to be the masters of the world. As regards the Christians, it would suffice to say that they have made the rest of the world revolve round them. The Christian population of the world is increasing by leaps and bounds. From

the point of intellect also, the largest number of high intellectuals of the world comes from among the Christians. When sept exogamy was non-existent among the Indo-Aryans or was loosely observed by them, and when they habitually married their cognatic relations in the third generation, they were the leading race of the world. For the last 2,500 years, the Indo-Aryans have been observing the strict rules of sept and sapiṇḍa exogamy. But during all these years, as history will tell us, the Indo-Aryans have not been able to hold their own against the foreign invaders.

Under the rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy, as practised in the Deccan, marriage between the children of two brothers and of two sisters is prohibited, while marriage between the children of brother and sister is permitted. From the point of clan-organization, according to the patrilineal or matrilineal descent, there may be good grounds to prohibit marriage between the children of two brothers and two sisters, but according to biology there is absolutely no difference between the prohibited matings and the approved matings of cousins. In Northern India they avoid a great number of generations of cognates—sometimes seven generations and sometimes five; while in the line of the agnates marriage is barred for all times. This distinction made between the cognates and the agnates is unsupportable from the point of view of biology.

Regarding sept exogamy, its restrictions are so extravagant and so far-reaching that one may not even try to give a rational defence of them. To avoid hundreds of agnatic generations in marriage cannot be justified on any ground either medical, eugenic or religious. According to Galton's famous theory of inheritance, eugenically cognates and agnates stand on the same footing, and the

fraction of inheritance that a man derives from his ancestors six or seven degrees removed is so small that it may safely be ignored; and it diminishes by one-half for every preceding generation. Thus, advocates of a cross or outbreeding should have absolutely no objection to allow marriage after the sixth or seventh generation in the cognatic and the agnatic lines as well. The Brahmanic rule of sapiṇḍa exogamy prohibits intermarriage of the cognates, only up to the fifth or seventh degree. One may reasonably say that the same rule on the same analogy should be made applicable also to agnatic relations.

For that section of the Hindu population who altogether refuses to consider the problem of marriage from the eugenic standpoint, it may be pointed out that sept exogamy originated with gotra—pure and simple, meaning family name or surname. Manu, the first law-giver of the Indo-Aryans, enunciates the rule of sept exogamy in its simplest form, prohibiting marriage in the gotra or family. Millions and millions of gotras or surnames were afterwards grouped together on the basis of pravaras under ten heads. The gotra Ṛishis and the pravara Ṛishis are not inter-related by any blood tie. The more orthodox section of the Brahmins may, therefore, see the justice of going back to Manu's rule of exogamy, and prohibit marriage only in the family. Regarding the restrictions of sapiṇḍa exogamy, while discountenancing, along with Manu, marriage in the third cognatic generation they may, with every propriety, recognize the validity of marriage between cognates in the fourth generation and onward.

There is another reason which must appeal to the orthodox-minded for loosening the exogamous restrictions in the present times. When the Sūtra-writers laid

down the rule of sept exogamy, the Brahmin community was not divided into endless endogamous sub-castes. When the field of selection is sufficiently wide, exogamous restrictions are comparatively less troublesome. But to try to make the same rule applicable in entirely altered circumstances is to try to put up on one's grown-up body the jacket that one wore when a child. Even in the Sūtra times, when the Sūtra-writers found that their rule of exogamy, prohibiting marriage between persons reciting one identical pravara, was too harassing in the case of the Kevala Bhṛigu and Kevala Aṅgiras groups, they did relax the original rule. If the exogamous restrictions, current among the Brahmins, are really harassing, is it too much to expect from the modern Brahmins that they re-examine the restrictions and introduce suitable changes in the rules, just as their forefathers did under similar circumstances two thousand years before ?

As I have already mentioned, all Hindu castes, high or low, are being slowly Brahmanised. In many cases the transformation is deliberate, and so it is rather swift ; but all other castes indirectly and unconsciously are doing the same thing. One word of advice to the non-Brahmins may not be out of place here. With all their laudable zeal for following the Brahmanical ideals, they would be acting in their own interests if they analyse and sift before they embrace any Brahmanical dogma.

Explanation of important abbreviations used in the book.

A. Brāhmaṇa.	..	Aitareya Brāhmaṇa of the Ṛig-veda, Haug's edition (1863).
Ā. Gṛi.	..	Āśvalāyana's Gṛihya Sūtra, S. B. E. Series.
Aparārka.	..	Aparārka's commentary on Yājñavalkya Smṛiti, Ānand-āśrama edition.
Āpas. Dha.	..	Āpastamba Dharma Sūtra, S. B. E. Series.
Āpas. Gṛi.		Āpastamba Gṛihya Sūtra, S.B.E. Series.
Ā. Ś. Sūtra.	..	Āśvalāyana Śrauta Sūtra, published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
Banerjee.	..	Hindu Law of Marriage & Stri-dhan (1879).
Bau. Dha.	..	Baudhāyana Dharma Sūtra, S. B. E. Series.
Bṛihaspati.	..	Bṛihaspati Smṛiti, S. B. E. Series.
Chaturvarga-Chintā-maṇi.		B. I. edition.
Crooke.		The Tribes and Castes of the North-Western Provinces, and Oudh, 4 Volumes (1896).
Dharma-Sindhu.		Published by Y. G. Dikshit, Poona (1911).
Enthoven.		Tribes and Castes of Bombay, 3 Volumes.
Frazer.		Totemism and Exogamy, 4 Volumes (1910).
Gautama.		Gautama Dharma Sūtra, S.B.E. Series.
Go. Gṛi.		Gobhila Gṛihya Sūtra, S.B.E. Series.
Hearn.		Aryan Household, published by Longmans Green & Co. (1879).
Hi. Gṛi.		Hiraṇyakeśin Gṛihya Sūtra, S. B. E. Series.

Huth.	Marriage of Near Kin.
Kāṭha. Gṛi.	Kāṭhaka Gṛihya Sūtra, Dr. Caland's edition.
Mabh.	Mahābhārata, Kumbhakonam edition.
Mā. Gṛi.	Mānava Gṛihya Sūtra, Gaekwad's Oriental Series.
Manu.	Mānava Dharma Śāstra, Manḍlik's edition.
Max Müller.	A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature, published by Pāṇini Office, Allahabad (1912).
Mitaksharā.	Published by the Pāṇini Office, Allahabad (1913).
Morgan.	Ancient Society (1877).
Nārada.	Narada-Smṛiti, S. B. E. Series.
Nirṇayasindhu.	Nirṇayasāgar edition, 1905.
Parāśara.	Parāśara Dharma Saṁhitā, published in the Bombay Sanskrit Series.
P. Chentsalrao.	Gotrapravaranibandha-kadambam, Government Oriental Library Series, Mysore (1900).
Risley.	Tribes and castes of Bengal, (1891).
Rose.	A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province, 3 Volumes.
Russell.	Tribes and Castes of Central Province of India, 4 Volumes, (1916).
Ś. Brāhmaṇa.	Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa, S. B. E. Series.
Tai. Brāhmaṇa	Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa.
T. Brāhmaṇa.	Tāṇḍya Mahā-Brāhmaṇa, published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
Thurston.	Castes and Tribes of Southern India, 6 Volumes, (1911).
T. Saṁhitā.	Taittirīya Saṁhitā.

Vasishṭha.	Vasishṭha Dharma Sūtra, S.B.E. Series.
Vidhāna-Pārijāta.	Published by the Asiatic Society of Bengal.
Vīramitrodaya.	Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series.
Viśvarūpa.	Viśvarūpāchārya's Bālakrīdā, Trivendrum Sanskrit Series.
Vishṇu.	Vishṇu Smṛiti, S. B. E. Series.
Westermarck.	The History of Human Marriage, 3 Volumes, (1921).

Corrections.

P. 26 L. 30	for Vatsapri or Bhālandana	read Vatsaprī or Bhalandana.
P. 57 L. 28	for Āsheya.	read Ārsheya.
P. 72 L. 34	for 19-9-21	read 18-9-2.
P. 86 L. 26	for Vrajapati	read Vrājapati
P. 93 L. 14	for Bahmanical	read Brahmanical
P. 100 L. 25	for practice	read practise
P. 102 L. 34	for I-1-38	read II-1-38
P. 136 L. 24	for generaly	read generally
P. 168 L. 34	for p. 108	read pp. 100-103
P. 182 L. 35	for XXI-9	read XXI-7
P. 189 L. 35	for 169	read 170
P. 204 L. 32	for S	read So
P. 237 L. 23	for neice	read niece
P. 246 L. 2	for usua	read usual
P. 262 L. 21	for genertion	read generation
P. 271 L. 13	for group	read groups
P. 276 L. 11	for laces	read classes
P. 276 L. 24	for worsihp	read worship
P. 283 L. 31	for Statue	read Statute

INDEX.

G.

H.

R.

T.

W

Y

Z